

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1887.

ARTICLE I.

THE ELEMENTS OF SUCCESS IN PREACHING.

By F. W. CONRAD, D. D., Philadelphia.

Preaching means proclaiming the gospel, as the embodiment of religious truth, and in its popular acceptance, it embraces both the sermon as a literary production, and its delivery as a rhetorical performance. It is a means to an end, and as such, must be constituted of such characteristics as are adapted to attain it. The end of preaching is to induce man to cultivate excellence of character and usefulness in this life, in order that he may attain immortal blessedness in that life to come.

The faculties of the soul, through the combined and consistent exercise of which the immediate and ultimate ends of preaching may be attained, are the imagination, the understanding, the heart, the conscience, the will and the memory. These faculties are distinct in their nature, and each is adapted to exert a specific influence upon the rest, culminating in their combined action upon the will. Each of these faculties is so constituted, that it can be reached and brought into proper exercise by the presentation of truth in a particular form. Graphic descriptions are calculated to kindle the imagination; clear statements and logical arguments to interest and convince the understanding; pathetic appeals to move the heart; ethical principles to bind the

VOL. XVII. No. 2.

20

conscience; and in their united motive power as recalled by memory, to influence the will in its choices. Just in proportion, therefore, as the elements that enter into the constitution of preaching are adapted to bring into healthy exercise each of the motive-bearing faculties just named, in that proportion will preaching tend to secure right action or success.

Speech is one of the greatest and best gifts of God to man. It gives expression to the hidden operations of the mind, heart and will of man, and reveals them to his fellows. This is done through conversation in social intercourse, writing and printing in literary circles, and by the proclamation of "the truth as it is in Jesus" any where but especially in the house of God. To attain success preaching must draw the hearers, secure their attention, impart instruction and employ all the motives of the law and the gospel, in order to induce repentance towards God, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, growth in knowledge, and holiness, in usefulness and happiness. Preaching can be satisfied with nothing less, and without such results can not claim success, but must be pronounced a failure. Any thing, therefore, having a direct bearing upon, and an adaptation to secure any one of the results just mentioned, must constitute an element of success in preaching. In this category, we mention the following:

1. *The selection of a distinct subject or theme*, which should be couched and announced in a form of words calculated to excite interest and awaken expectation. This informing idea, as metaphysicians term it, should, like the germ deposited in the ground, draw around and assimilate to it, all the matter introduced into the discourse, which as it proceeds in its delivery, should continue to increase in intellectual and moral momentum, and culminate in making a distinct, deep and permanent impression upon every hearer. The practice of not announcing the theme under the impression that the hearers' curiosity will be awakened in discovering it as the delivery proceeds, has not unfrequently resulted in disappointment, the hearer not finding out what the topic was, and going home without any distinct idea of what the preacher preached about, and no recollection of anything in particular of what he said. The practice of get-

ting up sermons, without any particular subject and made up of fragmentary, disconnected remarks, is no less objectionable than that of withholding the announcement of the subject.

2. *Systematic arrangement.* The ideal sermon, as determined by homiletic rules, embraces the introduction designed to awaken attention to the subject, the body or matter consisting of statement, explanation, argument, description, illustration and exhortation, and the peroration or conclusion, applying and enforcing the moral and practical points contained in it. All the elements included in the subject matter may be found in a single discourse and most of them should constitute a part of each sermon in such a form and measure as the theme and design of the preacher may require. As order imparts additional strength, the systematic arrangement of the parts and matter of a sermon becomes an indispensable requisite in achieving success in preaching. What a thorough knowledge and skillful use of tools is to the mechanic, an accurate acquaintance with homiletics, and a wise application of the rules of sermonizing, are to the preacher. The neglect of its study and the depreciation of its value are alike to be deprecated. The self-conceit which, under the delusion of possessing such a degree of originality as to call forth successive and uninterrupted trains of consecutive thought, so as to render homiletic rules unnecessary, makes sad work in many pulpits. It excludes systematic arrangement which is one of the most important elements of success in preaching, and in many places multiplies ministerial failures.

3. *Excellence of style.* Language is the medium of expressing and communicating thought, and this is accordingly brought into requisition, and style becomes another important element in preaching. Its distinguishing features are clearness and simplicity, accuracy and terseness, beauty and force. Such a style of thought and composition is adapted to gain and keep the attention of the hearers, and bring into timely exercise the faculties necessary to success. The temptation to pervert the style of the pulpit is great, and many preachers have fallen into it. Overlooking the province of the understanding which is reached by instruction and argument, they have adopted a florid and fanciful style, calculated to tickle the fancy, inflame the imagin-

ation, and arouse the feelings, furnishing entertainment, and calling forth pleasing emotions, but which like dissolving views, flit in quick succession before the mind, making but a momentary impression and leaving no trace behind. Such a style of preaching, while it caters to curiosity, leaves the mind a blank, vitiates the taste, fails to reach the conscience or move the will, and cannot therefore attain the true end of preaching.

But there is also danger of so undervaluing the importance of cultivating excellence of style, that many entirely neglect it. Disparaging thorough ministerial training and relying upon the immediate assistance of the Holy Spirit, they neglect study and due preparation, depend upon the inspiration of the moment, and belch forth a torrent of ungrammatical and crude utterances, superficial and disconnected remarks, savoring more of the incoherent and unintelligible rantings of an ignorant mountebank, than the thoughtful, instructive and edifying promptings of the Holy Spirit.

But while the cases of the perversion and neglect of style just cited may be regarded as sporadic and extreme, there are not wanting examples among the regularly educated ministry, who by fastidiousness of taste and over nicety of expression weaken their style, and divest their discourses in a corresponding degree of effectiveness. As literary artists they paint with bright water colors, which may for a moment dazzle the fancy of the multitude, but which fail to make any lasting impression upon them, or, changing the figure, as clerical house-keepers, they furnish their tables with an excess of sweet-meats and a deficiency of solid and substantial food; or in other words, they give their boarders too much dessert, and too little bread and meat.

Nor must we overlook another kind of educated preachers, who greatly underrate the value of style, despise the graces of rhetoric, beauty of thought, and aptness and force of expression. They regard the truths of the Scriptures as possessed of such vitalizing power, that it proves more effective when unadorned with the attractions of style. They regard every person living within reach of their churches as morally bound to be regular attendants upon their unsavory ministrations and give the most

earnest heed to their undigested harangues, superficial platitudes, common-place utterances, and downright vulgarisms of style. When the outside world vote such preaching a bore and refuse to attend, and the inside elect, unable to discover the wheat among the chaff, drop off and seek for pasture elsewhere, then such slovenly preachers try to comfort themselves with the plea, that the children of this world do not appreciate *spiritual* preaching, and that even some of the children of light have itching ears, and, like the Greeks at Athens, are prone to run after new things. Whereas, the true state of things seems not to enter the minds of such preachers—that they themselves are at fault; that their mis-called sermons are so deficient in arrangement and matter and style, as to convey neither instruction to the impenitent, nor tend to the edification of believers.

4. *Scripturalness of matter.* Preaching is distinguished from all other forms of communicating ideas and facts through public address, by the peculiarity of the truth which it makes known. While preaching may properly appropriate all other kinds of truth and make them subservient to the attainment of its ends, its special province is to publish religious truth. And as its name originated in the Scriptures, its matter must also be drawn from the inspired word of God. The text, the subject of discourse, the matter introduced, and the lessons enforced, must be thoroughly scriptural. To take a text from the Bible, as the basis of some striking motto, and descant upon it with sentimental clap-trap, in a manner calculated to excite curiosity, provoke laughter and provide amusement for an audience, is not preaching *the Word*, but blatherskiting in the house of the Lord. Such preachers or rather declaimers, burn incense on the altar of God with strange fire, and feed their hearers with mere husks instead of the strong meat of the Word.

"They win a smile, and court a grin,
Where they should start a tear.
The hungry sheep look up, and gape,
And stare, and are not fed."

The Holy Ghost declares such preaching "as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal," and pronounces them to be "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever."

The large proportion of Scripture, introduced by Mr. Moody into his addresses, and the tact with which he uses and applies it, constitutes the strongest element and the true secret of the success of his preaching. The remarkable popularity of Dr. John Hall of New York can be directly traced to the pre-eminent scriptural character of all his ministrations.

5. *Spiritual unction.* The natural man is the product of the creative work of the Father; the spiritual man is the product of the new-creating power of the Holy Ghost, through the redemption of the Son. The natural man can neither discern, know or receive the things of the Spirit of God, says Paul, and John declares that the Christian, the spiritual man has an unction from the Holy One, and knoweth all things. While, therefore the meaning of the Scriptures in their letter and form, may be apprehended by the natural reason of man, their hidden sense, spirit or essence, can only be apprehended through the aid or unction of the Holy Ghost.

In order to possess it, the preacher must be a man who has been begotten of the truth, the born of the Spirit, and made a new creature in Christ Jesus. As a fountain cannot rise above its head, and men cannot gather figs of thistles, neither can the natural beget the spiritual; and the purely natural and rational exhibitions of unconverted preachers do not ordinarily and legitimately result in bringing men truly to the knowledge of the truth, and if, notwithstanding this, any are led to Christ through them, it is not because of, but in spite of their rational performance. They must therefore be classed among those who sat in Moses' seat in Christ's day, and who, although they expounded the law, neither understood its spirit nor practiced its precepts in their lives.

This "unction" cannot be described any more than the operations of the Spirit in effecting regeneration. It bears the same relation to the natural understanding, as a knowing faculty, as genius does to the ordinary insight of the aesthetic faculty. Genius gives the poet, the musician, the artist, such an insight into the ideal of beauty in poetry, music, sculpture and painting, and so stimulates in them efforts to actualize their ideals in verse, melody and form, but the ordinary aesthetic capacity of

man, may, in a measure, appreciate the beautiful, when exhibited to it, but destitute of genius it cannot create beauty itself. And so the spiritual unction of the preacher gives him such an insight into the true sense of Scripture, renders it so congenial to him, and impels him to expound it with earnestness and delight, to his hearers, while the unconverted preacher, destitute of it, sees and presents only the husk of truth in a mechanical way, with no more special interest in preaching than the hireling has in going through the routine of his task, impelled by the expectation of his wages. But while it cannot be described, and cannot be discerned by the natural man, although he may feel its influence without knowing what it is, it is at once discerned by the true Christian. There is a *something* about the character, tone and manner of a man of God, explaining with spirited unction the mysteries of religious experience and true godliness, which those who have experimental piety immediately discern, and their spirits are kindled and their hearts edified by it. It was this that Christ referred to when he said: "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. My sheep hear my voice, I know them and they follow me, but a stranger will they not follow, because they know not the voice of strangers."

6. *The skillful use of figures.* As the imagination originates intellectual imagery, so does it delight in figures of speech, and through them becomes the medium of imparting instruction. What color and expression are to a painting, figure imparts to thought and speech. It is the ornament that adorns language with beauty, and invests it both with attractions and force. It furnishes the sparks that kindle speech into a glow, and furnishes the fire of oratory. Figure embraces beautiful imagery in expression, analogies between natural and supernatural truths, comparisons between the operations of nature and the influences of the Holy Spirit, contrasts between the things of this world, and the things of the world to come. Good judgment must be exercised in the degree and skillful use of imagery in preaching.

As the palate is surfeited with a surplus of sweet-meats, but feels a want when it receives none at all, a lady when overdressed with ribbons and jewelry destroys her attractiveness on

the one hand, and by disregard of propriety and beauty of dress, gains little consideration on the other. Due proportion in each example would furnish the happy medium, and attain the best results in supplying the body with food, and ornamenting the person with taste and beauty. And the same is true in the use of figure in preaching. Men of fine imaginations are in danger of being so carried away with the ornate in preaching, as to indulge in excess of imagery, at the expense of other equally important elements in preaching; while men of little imagination may so neglect it that their sermons might be compared to a tree, with trunk and branches, but destitute of leaves and flowers. The wisdom of the preacher must be exercised in attaining the golden mean, which will determine in a good degree, the measure of success in preaching.

7. *Apt Illustrations.* The impressions of sense are stronger than the apprehensions of thought. We are more impressed by witnessing an event, than by reading or hearing an account of it. This is the secret of the power of the drama, and the popularity of object-teaching, and panoramic exhibitions. The same distinction obtains between the mere statement of a truth and its presentation through a graphic illustration, as well as between the mere narration and the witnessing of events. These illustrations may be invented by the mind, drawn from the records of history, the facts of science, the works of nature, the habits of animals, the vegetable kingdom, daily occurrences, providential circumstances, and the thesaurus of anecdote. The judgment of the preacher must determine the number and character of the illustrations which he may introduce into his discourses, and upon the skill shown by him in embellishing them thereby will depend, in large measure, both the attractiveness and effectiveness of his preaching.

8. *Variety of topics.* The eye wearies in looking without diversion at the same objects; the ear grows dull under the same sounds; and the palate at last rejects the most delicious food with which it has become satiated. Change is indispensable to sharpen the edge of the pleasures of sense, and variety of topics to excite and keep up the interest of the hearer in preaching. Variety should, however, not be confined to change of subject,

but include also different arrangement, peculiarity of treatment, variations in expression as well in the method of communication and the style of delivery. Although it may be said, apologetically, that the essential doctrines of Christianity are comparatively few, and that the Christian pulpit has but one theme, "Jesus Christ and him crucified,"—it should be answered that when the extent of the Scriptures, the number of the subjects they contain, the different forms in which they are presented, the number of the writers, and the peculiarities of method and style adopted by them, are all considered, it would seem that no sufficient apology can be made by the preachers to the people, for converting the pulpit into a tread-mill in which they make their narrow weekly round, in the same measured step, and accompanied with the same tune, set to the same key. Where sameness of subjects and perpetual repetitions of the same ideas and phrases weary the hearers, fail to edify, and reduce their number, an important element of success in preaching is wanting, for which no satisfactory apology can be made.

9. *Adaptation to the wants of all.* Congregations are made up of persons of all ages, sexes, classes, vocations, conditions and character. Each person has peculiar constitutional wants, is placed in different circumstances, and exposed to special temptations. The same may be said of classes and their peculiar condition and surroundings. With these the preacher should acquaint himself by personal intercourse, pastoral visitation and observation, and to the supply of their respective wants he should endeavor to adapt his preaching. For the accomplishment of this important end God has made special provision in his word, and given special directions to his ministers. The Scriptures contain milk for babes and strong meat for those who are of riper age. The duty of feeding both the lambs and the sheep of the fold, of withholding from the people nothing revealed by God that would be profitable to them, and of giving to saint and sinner his due portion in season, is enjoined upon every ambassador of Christ, and constitutes an important element of success in preaching.

10. *An effective delivery.* Commencing with the choice of a
VOL. XVII. No. 2.

distinct subject, as the first, we have presented consecutively eight other elements that enter into the constitution of a model sermon, and according to the natural order, we now add delivery as the tenth element of success in preaching. Although placed last, it is by no means the least, but the greatest. Indeed, a sermon may be so successfully prepared as to attain almost ideal perfection, and be delivered in so defective a manner as to fail in the attainment of its end. What is true of a single sermon is not unfrequently illustrated in the history of the pulpit. There are hundreds of pastors who prepare their sermons so carefully that they attain rare excellence as sermonizers, but are either so deficient in gifts of speech, or have been so wanting in their elocutionary training, or have contracted such a poor, monotonous delivery, or so fallen into the habit of reading closely in a humdrum manner, that their preaching became uninteresting to their audiences, and proved comparatively unsuccessful. Too much stress cannot, therefore, be laid upon delivery and its importance cannot well be overestimated. Yet, strange to say, there is no part of a minister's education which has received so little direct attention, and been so generally neglected as that of delivery.

Delivery is to the sermon what speech is to thought. While undelivered, like thought unexpressed, it can only be known by and exert an influence upon its composer. To instruct and influence others it must be delivered. Rhetoric, as an art, is not subjective. Its rules are not based upon abstract principles but drawn from observation. The rhetoricians observed how effective orators spoke, and thus learned the art of speaking, and their directions are designed to secure an imitation of the promptings of nature in oratory. We consequently place naturalness at the head of the characteristics of delivery. This cannot well be described, but it can very readily be detected. Observe two intelligent men in conversation on an important subject on which they are both deeply interested. How earnest they become! How rapidly thought is generated! How spontaneous their utterances! How clear and forcible their language! How emphatic their mode of expression! And how natural their whole manner of speech! As a listener, your attention

is fixed; you become absorbed in the conversation, and carry lasting impressions away. Now let all this be changed! A stenographer has taken down the conversation, and the same men appear before you with copy in hand, read the conversation to you in monotonous tones, after the manner of a school boy, and you will be struck with the greatness of the change. You will be compelled to make an effort to give them your attention, and feel relieved when it is over. This illustrates the difference between a natural and an unnatural delivery. We admit, however, that there are some readers of sermons, who so closely imitate nature in their delivery that they become effective in their pulpit ministrations; while on the other hand, there are those also, who, either from want of ability, neglect of preparation, and the contraction of an unnatural manner, exhibit defects in their delivery, no less marked than those of poor readers, and detract in a corresponding degree from their success in preaching. Naturalness embraces ease and self-possession, expressive posture, movement and gesture, which we must content ourselves in merely mentioning.

As description is rendered emphatic by contrast, we also mention awkwardness, a lazy, lounging attitude, leaning on the pulpit-board, staring at vacancy, turning towards one part of the audience, pounding the pulpit, stamping the feet, clapping the hands, turning the eye brows up and down, straining the voice to the highest pitch, suddenly lowering it to a whisper as well as all grotesque postures in the pulpit, as detrimental to effective delivery.

Nor must we overlook the abuse of emphasis by its too frequent and improper use, so as to lose its effect and become monotonous and insignificant. Affectation of tone and manner are no less objectionable. There is also a non-descript but prevalent manner of delivery, designated by Dr. Schmucker as the *preacher's*, as distinguished from the natural speaker's style. We called it a *mouthy* style at the seminary. It is contracted under the impression that preaching is something so different from talking, that a peculiar style and solemnity of tone and expression are demanded, and in departing from nature, each preacher who has contracted such habit, cannot easily correct it, although

he may know that it has not only spoiled his own natural style, but has also impaired his efficiency and usefulness in the pulpit. There are some preachers who are so inveterately given to this unfortunate habit of speaking that they cannot read a chapter, offer a prayer in a family, or even say grace at table, without doing it in a loud, awfully solemn, unnatural, affected and altogether unbecoming manner.

But we have exhausted our allotted space, and in conclusion we desire to emphasize the peroration of a sermon, its character, design and delivery. Its design may be learned from its etymology—*per*, through *oratio*, the discourse, *going through or over the discourse*; that is, rehearse the parts of the discourse, in order to secure concentration of their combined force upon the hearer. Its special significance is involved in its being the conclusion. Like the closing words of a testament, or the last paragraph of an authoritative political proclamation, the concluding part of a sermon should be naturally and skilfully arranged, carefully worded, tersely expressed, and impressively delivered. It is also called the application, signifying that through all the lessons taught, the moral principles inculcated and the practical duties enjoined, are to be applied and enforced. The peroration bears the same relation to a sermon that the lawyer's summing up does to his whole case, and as the analysis of the evidence and the presentation of the points of law by the judge do to his whole charge. The lawyer who should so undervalue the summing up as to neglect it, would not only lose his case, but his reputation and practice also. The judge who should fail to bring the salient points of the law and the evidence before the jury, would leave their minds in a state of doubt and perplexity, rendering an intelligent verdict according to the facts involved, impossible. And the preacher who neglects to close his sermons with inferential, recapitulating, hortatory perorations, and who satisfies himself with a few concluding sentences, referring to the subject, and ending with the stereotyped ejaculation: "The Lord add his blessing," divests his discourses of their most important part and fails in making a distinct impression of the truth contained in his sub-

ject. A sermon without a peroration is a rhetorical blunder and literary botch-work. It is like a word without its last syllable, a paragraph without its last sentence, a book without its last chapter.

As a striking illustration of all the elements of success in preaching united in one person, we present *Luther as a pulpit orator*. Oratory is, in many respects, the greatest gift that God has conferred upon man. The attainment of eminence in its practice requires such a combination of intellect and sensibility, imagination and logic, genius and acquirements, together with voice, manner and physique as are found in but few men. The great orators of the world can be counted upon the fingers of a man, Demosthenes, Cicero, Chrysostom, Massillon, Whitfield, Pitt, Webster, and Luther towering above them all. Melancthon said of the latter, that his words were "thunderbolts," and Jean Paul Richter pronounced them "half battles." Dr. Calvin E. Stowe describes him in the following discriminating and graphic manner: "Luther, as a revolutionary orator, was irresistible. So much coolness, and so much fire; so much self-possession, and so much excitability; so much logical power, and so much exuberance of fancy; so much good sense, and so much ready wit, with such advantages of person and voice, has seldom, if ever been found in one individual. Conceive of the steady, flaming, religious fervor of George Whitfield, united with the perspicuity to seize, and the genius to reproduce, every phase and fleeting form of human character—the skill to touch, by the right word and the right metaphor, in exactly the right place, every chord of popular emotion, which characterizes Shakespeare, and all this set off with a muscular frame of fine proportions and manly strength, a fair glowing face, which portrayed every sentiment before it was uttered, a large, clear, blue eye, that radiated his very soul (and such a soul!), a voice powerful as thunder and musical as an organ, and you have some idea of what Luther was as a public speaker." And in describing the effectiveness of Luther as a pulpit orator, he says, "His sentences were like charges of grape and canister shot—hitting in all directions, hitting every where, and hitting all the time." And I add, hitting with such crushing weight as to demolish the

superstructure of error set up by Romanism, and rearing on their ruins monuments of truth, that mark the pathway of modern civilization and Christianity.

ARTICLE II.

THE GROUNDS OF HEATHEN SALVATION.

By REV. PROF. J. C. F. RUPP, A. M., Zelenople, Pa.

Sometimes the place which a question gains in the public mind is out of all proportion to its importance; yet the emphasis laid upon some features of such a question often has the tendency to mischievous results. For example, nearly all the great controversies in the Christian world had their origin in beginnings which in their development marked epochs in religious thought. The present discussion of the theory of probation after death is such a question. It is looming up in vast proportions in view of its possible influence. It may revolutionize the conservatism of the past. It is invading the Church's most promising field. It robs the earnest missionary of his chiefest glory and most inspiring motives, making his self-sacrifice only a selfish aim, and him the votary to mistaken views and devotee to fanatical impulses.

In their latest utterances the advocates of this theory, which has not yet risen to the dignity of a doctrine, argue that the vast majority of men who have lived, or are now living, have received or will receive their personal probation beyond death: *all* those indeed who do not finally reject Christ during the earthly life will have another opportunity for the formation of personal character, on the basis and under the motives of a system of redemption.

This proposition has two aspects: as a question of pure dialectics it might enlist the sympathies of many, who cannot admit of other than intellectual elements in the demonstration of a theorem, and again, in questions of faith rather than knowledge, refuse to bend everything to the necessary lines of thought. Our limited intellectual horizon weakens the force of arguments

based solely on human consciousness. For this is not a question which appeals for its solution to intellectual, ethical or æsthetic emotions. Our higher sensibilities, our ideas of right and wrong, our judgment and reason, cannot read the mind and will of God, or determine divine decrees. Hence, we look for bed-rock on which to build. Like a storm-tossed ship we must anchor to solid foundation.

This theory in the religious world has an analogous position to evolution in the physical world. Its advocates claim that it is the necessary and scientific development of religious thought. They represent various shades of opinion. Like some philosophers who admit the results of evolution but dispute its methods, they refuse to be classified as "new theologians," yet accept the product of the "progressive theology." They have as confident hope for the heathen as for their own salvation. They do not experience Luther's difficulty to understand how God can be just and yet justify the sinner, even *on* the merits and conditions of the atonement; *apart* from the vicarious sacrifice *they* cannot understand how God can be just without justifying the sinner. They are zealots like Dr. Hawkins, who out of their tender sympathies believe in heathen salvation, but give only a disloyal support to their logical premise. They have no one distinct and positive reason for the hope that is in them, but ground their arguments on human sensibilities and rational consciousness, and then marshal in confirmation of their opinion isolated and detached passages of Scripture. Such arguments have not the strength displayed by scholars of solid attainments, who, like Archdeacon Farrar, base their hypotheses on the solitary texts of Scripture, and support their exegesis by brilliant rhetoric. But there is another class, who, like Bishop Foster, in his *Outlook of the World*,* seem content, with more confidence, to rest their convictions on the *a priori* conceptions of truth and intellectual strength, and with less concern for any biblical support to these judgments of reason.

The theory of probation after death, as now expounded, is the logical development of the conviction which Dr. Hawkins

*N. Y. *Independent*, April 15, 1886.

avows with respect to the heathen. Now, I propose to discuss the principles underlying the salvation of the heathen with reference to the theory of probation only where they touch. Yet the rule which determines the grounds of heathen salvation is a final answer to this theory of probation, and *vice versa*. There must be some norm of authority by which to determine correct principles in this question of heathen salvation. It will determine the method by which are appropriated to the heathen the mediatorial work and the merits of Christ's death. It will disclose the underlying principles in our theory of heathen salvation. The word of God declares that there is only one name given under heaven among men whereby they must be saved. No fertile imagination can find a substitute for this universal condition, whatever other figments may be read into the saving doctrine of the word of life. The one method of appropriation by faith seems to be as general, for the divine commission is given in all seriousness, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. It touches every spot on the globe and includes every rational creature outside of the pale of visible discipleship; and, while this condition lasts, will "the missionary department of the Christian ministry abide in the Church a divine institution."

Probation after death is an attempt to define the mode of this appropriation by faith. But neither it nor any other mode for heathen salvation, which has been mentioned, is on historical ground in its apprehension of truth. They all profess hostility to the so-called scholastic dogmatism, yet agree with the most rationalistic type of scholasticism in affirming that only what is clearly known can be trustworthy; and make self-consciousness the ultimate source and ground of religious knowledge. Perhaps I ought to correct an inaccuracy, for this tendency is historical; it produced both the extravagances of mysticism and the later skeptical rationalism, besides many other isms.

Theology is well-named the queen of sciences, for its material and rule of scientific inquiry are of the highest source and authority; and in the use of these divine elements it has enlisted the support of the highest human powers and faculties. Its form is scientific, but many of its fundamental principles are laid

and sealed in the blood of martyrs. Apply the principles of scientific theology to this question of probation, then analyze the elements on which the theory is built, and lastly by a correct exegesis, not of paragraphs but of the whole word of God, discover the primordial on which a true theory of heathen salvation is grounded.

I. The "new or progressive theologians" find fault with dogmatic theology touching this theme without first inquiring into its fundamental principles. Hence, for a moment look at the historical grounds of scripture-interpretation in the Christian Church.

For the source of religious knowledge and the supreme rule of faith, Roman Catholics appeal to scripture and tradition, "laying the chief stress on tradition. Evangelical Protestantism makes the scripture alone the supreme rule, but uses tradition and reason as means in ascertaining its true sense."* The common principle on which the Reformers stood was the principle of Christianity itself as revealed in scripture. These principles underlie three great systems of theology, for there are two distinct types of Protestant theology. The Reformed begins with scripture as the rule by which to determine its theology; the Lutheran begins with the word of scripture and builds on this foundation. The one reasons from divine decrees by inexorable logic; the other begins with the incarnation and person of Christ. The one builds like Abelard by reason, the other like Anselm by faith. "The legitimate use of reason is allowed by the Catholic and still more by the Protestant Church, and both have produced scholastic systems in full harmony with orthodoxy. Christianity is above reason, but not against reason."† Hence with these primal differences and by an honest use of these principles, there can be no wide divergence from a common result. The Roman Catholic would proceed by sight and sense, the Reformed by reason, which is the limit of its credibility, and the Lutheran by faith which subordinates and sanctifies reason. Thus, there is a difference in the methods of appre-

*Dr. Schaff, *Hom. Rev.*, June, 1886.

†Dr. Schaff, *Ibid.*

hending truth. Do these different methods produce different results, when applied to the theory of probation?

What hope of heathen salvation does Roman Catholic tradition entertain? "It almost closes the door of heaven against all who are living in the valley of the shadow of death."* The epistle to the Hebrews declares that it is appointed unto men once to die but after this the judgment,—Roman Catholics add, "*immediately*, when the soul's eternal destiny is then and there determined."* Even that poetic fiction which they call purgatory,—but which the "new movement" calls "personal probation after death for the majority of men"—where the soul that is in a state of grace, but defiled by the guilt of all but mortal sin, must tarry until, by its atonement in suffering, it is purified from all stains, is not open to the heathen. Says Archbishop Kenrick who is called the glory of the American Catholic Church: "We can entertain hope for such as never heard of the institution of baptism, if with all their heart they sought God under the influence of his grace and with an earnest desire to do his will. But for such as may be guiltless in not having received it because they were ignorant of its divine institution, salvation is not secure. Their delinquencies against the natural law are just subject of condemnation: for whoever sinned without the law shall perish without the law. It is not for us to excuse or condemn, but simply recognize baptism as a necessary means of salvation. Salvation and the necessary means of obtaining it are the gratuitous gifts of divine bounty, and the judgments of God though just are unsearchable. When a condition of salvation is proclaimed on divine authority, it is rash to indulge in speculation; it is impious to arraign the divine decree at the tribunal of our erring reason. * * Whatever hope may be entertained of the salvation of those who have not heard the name of Christ, it must always be limited to such as through the inspiration of divine grace conceive supernatural faith in the existence of God and the rewards of a future life; for without such faith it is impossible to please God."†

*L. W. Reilly, *N. Y. Independent*, Oct. '86.

†See same, *N. Y. Ind.*, Oct. '86.

Even Dr. Hawkins concedes that there is but little more encouragement to be derived from the logical and formal method of apprehending religious truth. Dr. Withrow said, in his annual sermon before the Des Moines Convention, that "The heathen are not under exceptional and hopeless condemnation; that it has been hailed as a sign of progress and a proof that he is freeing himself from the bond of bigotry, when a man declares that he does not believe in the unconditional condemnation of the heathen. But who does believe such a thing?"

Evidently this eminent divine differs from Dr. Hawkins' understanding of the confession, for he says, "Knowing the Confession of Westminster is closely wrought on the articles of election and eternal destiny, one naturally turns to see if it says such a thing as that the heathen are under unconditional and causeless sentence of judgment. But looking, one finds it does not. For very distinctly those venerable divines of Westminster, in composing the confession, declared that 'none are under condemnation and dishonor except for their sins.'"

There is a rationalizing tendency in this formal method of apprehending religious truth, and whatever their other failings these confessors were not guilty of false logic. If we grant their premises, no doubt we will agree with their conclusions. For it is called only a spurious Calvinism which was voiced in the rebuke of the young cobbler who became Cary the missionary: that when God wants to convert the heathen he will do it without human help. The American Board for Foreign Missions adopted this resolution: "That this Board distinctly and emphatically disavows its belief in what is called the doctrine of probation after death." With reference to the tendency of this principle so condemned "they do heartily approve the action of the Prudential Committee in carefully guarding the Board from any committal to the approval of that doctrine, and advise a continuance of the caution in time to come." The action so commended was the refusal to appoint as missionaries candidates theologically unfit because of their belief in future probation, because of its "strong conviction that this new view is unscriptural and pernicious, tending to lead multitudes to fatal delusion,

ruinous to souls both in the present world and in the world to come."*

This system of theology proceeds by necessary laws of thought from a formulated structure to Christ. Rev. Dr. Win. Hayes Ward well defines it: "I never had any reason to vary from that vital doctrine which holds that the way to see the truth of God is by studying God's word, and getting at it through the reason and by faith in God." Again: "I do not like the new theory because I think it is based partly on a 'Christocentric' conception of theology which seems to me unreasonable, and partly because it is based upon an over-orthodox and over-strict theory of the interpretation of the scripture, which says that only those who believe shall be saved; and it draws the conclusion that if these people do not believe in this world, and they are going to be saved, it must be that they are going to get their belief in another world, because then they will have Christ presented to them and will then be saved."† This is the deductive method which proceeds from a general truth, the divine decrees and eternal destiny, to particular conclusions.

The Lutheran system, however, is Christocentric because it begins in Christ and builds on him as the chief corner-stone, but it also believes that now is the day of salvation. It is the inductive method by which from well-known particulars we arrive at general truths. Dr. Hawkins seems more comforted by what he calls the silence of the Lutheran Confessions, as if they had ignored a difficult question and shunned the responsibility of an expression. This is not the historical character of Lutheranism. It is wrought on the material principle, salvation by faith in Christ, and its use of scripture as a formal principle determines the properties of this faith. Its silence is due to the general argument, but much is implied in the confessions on other points which bear directly on this. For example: "The Gospel is properly such a doctrine as teaches what he who has not observed the law and therefore is condemned by it should believe, viz., Christ has expiated and made satisfaction for all sins, and without any merit of theirs has obtained forgiveness of sins, righteousness that avails before God and eternal life."‡

*The Great Debate, p. 47.

†See Schmid's Dogmatic.

‡The Great Debate, p. 54.

Lutheran theology teaches that the Spirit of God operates in the hearts of men only through the Word and Sacraments. "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is, the word which we preach." This word comes to men in two ways. It is either natural or revealed. "Full and saving knowledge of God we obtain, of course, only through revelation. But aside from this there exists a knowledge of God, for we find it even among the heathen."* This natural knowledge of God which the heathen possess may be extended, and confirmed by contemplation of the works and ways of God in nature and in history; but when so acquired it is subject to corruption and is at best very imperfect and, for this reason, insufficient to secure salvation. It is only the remnant of the knowledge which but for the fall would have been full and rich. It seems to awaken longing after true and perfect knowledge, and in some measure to regulate moral deportment. "Beyond all that we can learn concerning God and his relation to the world from reason and nature, there is room and necessity for the light and teaching of a supernatural revelation. The history of mankind shows unquestionably that when left to the mere light of nature and reason men hold low and inadequate conceptions of God, and are woefully wanting in the knowledge necessary to a right, pure and happy life. Even the most cultured nations without God's word have failed to attain a clear or steady conception of his character and will."†

This knowledge contains only the seed of the word, which in its original form was a part of the mental endowment of our first parents. In its fragmentary condition it is, as it were, only a little spark of primeval light, a diminutive drop from a vast ocean, or an atom of the ashes of a splendid house in ruins. Yet this spark is sufficient to kindle beacons which blaze from every cliff in heathenism. "By the authority of the word of God we do unquestionably know, past all peradventure do know, that men passing beyond the limits of this life are to be judged by the light they had in this life that has passed here. And the

*See Schmid's Dogmatic.

†Valentine's Rational Theism, 270.

responsibility is theirs for following the guidance of that light given according to this word to all men, which though it had but a single ray in the thick night of heathenism, and shining never so dimly, would in the issue have led those who followed it inevitably to the cross of Jesus Christ."* This is, as it were, a conditional sentence in Greek syntax, where the protasis states a present or past supposition contrary to fact or reality, and implies that the condition is not or was not fulfilled. Dr. Schaff (whom, strangely enough, Dr. Hawkins incorrectly quotes as supporting probation after death†) says, "There was a spiritual Israel scattered throughout the heathen world, that never received the circumcision of the flesh, but the unseen circumcision of the heart by the hand of that spirit which boweth where it listeth, and is not bound to any human laws and to ordinary means. The Old Testament furnishes several examples of true piety outside of the visible communion with the Jewish Church, in the persons of Melchisedec, the friend of Abraham, the royal priest, the type of Christ; Jethro, the priest of Midian; Rahab, the Canaanite woman and hostess of Joshua and Caleb; Ruth, the Moabitess and ancestress of our Saviour; King Hiram, the friend of David; the Queen of Sheba, who came to admire the wisdom of Solomon; Naaman the Syrian; and especially Job, the sublime sufferer, who rejoiced in the hope of his Redeemer."‡

These exceptions are examples of the extraordinary influence of the Holy Spirit and only serve to confirm the rule that divine grace does not come immediately. Where God has a special purpose, as in these examples, he confirms by his revealed word through his servants and prophets natural knowledge of himself. These rare examples of divine influence conclusively prove that such knowledge, although it did serve in them as such a medium, is totally corrupted by the wicked and deceitful heart.

There are some rare names in secular history also, as Confucius, Plato, Seneca, who are real noblemen by nature. But only one Plato is worthy of canonization. There are few such examples

*Dr. E. P. Goodwin, *The Great Debate*, 66.

†See *Hist. of Christ. Ch.*: Vol. II *Ante-Nicene Christ.*, p. 611.

‡*Hist. Christ. Ch.*, Vol. I: *Apost. Christianity*, p. 75.

in history, and fewer still of the uncultured Platos in the story of Christian missions. My one-time instructor, Dr. C. A. Stork, related an account of one such narrated, I believe, by Eliot, the missionary to the Indians; he was an Indian of devout and exalted moral qualities, who confirmed in his own experience the story of salvation. For he was sinful and unable to remedy his condition. But he reasoned and felt that God is good and must have made by the atonement of a Perfect Man full and vicarious satisfaction for him. He confided in this hope. He mentioned even a more notable character discovered in the wilds of Africa, whose knowledge acquired only by the light of nature was so accurate that he too believed there was a Saviour although he knew nothing of his historical manifestation. This same natural illumination has been graphically described in the opening chapters of *Ben-Hur*, in which divine grace is represented as operating through this spermatric word, as the medium, to lead the Hindu, the Egyptian and Greek to meet in the desert, whence, enlightened by his Star in the east, they now come to accept and adore their Saviour, who is the ideal and the fulfilment of philosophy and civilization of every type and age. I do not raise the question whether these rare individuals had a saving knowledge of Christ, but insist that even in such case they are too few to be more than isolated examples in as many centuries. There may be others of whom "like the mute and inglorious Miltons" we never hear, but they are only as drops in the ocean of humanity, for the Lord is not without a witness even in Babylon. Dr. Schaff says of ancient heathenism, and it is as true of modern heathenism: "The scattered elements of truth, morality and piety may be ascribed to three sources. In the first place, man even in his fallen state retains some traces of the divine image, a knowledge of God however weak, a moral sense or conscience, and a longing for union with the God-head, for truth and for righteousness. Secondly, some account must be made of traditions and recollections, however faint, coming down from the general primal revelations to Adam and Noah. But the third and most important of the heathen anticipations of truth is the all-ruling providence of God, who has never left himself without a witness. If such anticipation and knowledge of truth

is sufficient in such cases to be a medium of grace, these examples, at best, are only as Lot in Sodom and Gomorrah. But on what authority can Dr. Hawkins declare that *most* of the heathen will be saved?

II. If we analyze this theory of probation, we will find in it over against the strength of orthodoxy some inherent weaknesses, constitutional ailments which are incurable.

First, its foundation is weak. It is like the Washington monument which stood unfinished for half a century on its shattered base; but no amount of ecclesiastical engineering can replace with firm foundation its frail support without cracking the beautiful walls of this house built on sand. Nor is it true, I believe, as Dr. Hawkins asserts, that you can prove anything out of the Bible. For the word is a unit and sets forth but one doctrine of salvation.

A proper system of hermeneutics has not been, nor can be, built on rational consciousness, much less on human sensibilities. Rationalism is the main plank in the ground-work of the "new theology." It raises human reason above scripture and tradition, and accepts them only so far as they come within the limits of its comprehension. "It is in the modern what Gnosticism was in the ancient church—a revolt of private judgment against the popular faith and Church orthodoxy, an over-estimate of rhetoric knowledge but also a wholesome stimulus to inquiry and progress. It is not a church, or sect, but a school in the church, or rather, a number of schools which differ very considerably from each other."* By legitimate use of reason there is real progress, but this progress is perfectly consistent with a belief in revelation on subjects which lie beyond the boundary of time and sense. Luther repudiated the mystic dogma of the inner word and spirit, and insisted on submission to the written letter of the scriptures. He attributed all the errors and fanaticism of the Reformation period to the presumptuous inroads of human reason into the domain of faith.† This is the fundamental principle of this theory of probation, a rational and emotional abstraction, which appeals to scripture only for toler-

*See Schaff's *Ref. and Rational. Hom. Rev.*, June 1886.

†See Schaff, *Ibid.*

ation. But every passage, which it is claimed endorses this theory, is a minor chord in some greater symphony. To read into it human subjectivity is to introduce a discord in the general harmony, by separating it from its grammatical and historical connections.

Matt. 12 : 32 is often cited as a witness to this hypothesis but in violation of sound principles of hermeneutics. For the Saviour evidently taught that this sin against the Holy Ghost is never forgiven in this world, much less in the world to come. St. Mark (3 : 30) says "he that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness but is in danger of eternal damnation.* This language of hyperbole and exaggeration has the very opposite effect here claimed for it. It is to be interpreted in a manner precisely similar to the interpretation of Luke 14 : 26 where the Lord teaches the necessity of domestic love.

1 Peter 3 : 19 is another example of subjective interpretation. Besides the reasonable and orthodox understanding, it is also capable of a distinctly Lutheran interpretation. Here our Saviour's preaching was not of the gospel as on the Mount, but it was the proclamation of a herald. This is apparent to one who takes the trouble to compare the words in the original. The passage means Christ's descent "into hell to triumph over demons (see Col. 2 : 15 and Rev. 1 : 18), and to convince men that they were justly shut up in the infernal prison. His preaching in hell was *not evangelical*, which is proclaimed only to men in the kingdom of grace, but legal, accusatory, terrible. Even the antediluvians ought to have believed on Christ."†

Anything might be proven out of the Bible by such eclectic interpretation. It denied the doctrine of the Trinity until subjective personality was eliminated from exegesis. Then this great doctrine stood forth on the testimony of the whole inspired record, reasonable but higher than reason. Turn upon these passages the radiancy divine of such passages as Matt. 25 : 31ff, where the final judgment is described without any reference to this state of intermediary probation ; and Luke 16 : 26, where

*See note Schaff's Hist. Christ. Ch., Vol. II, p. 607.

†Schmid's Dogmat. (Holl. 778).

again it is expressly declared by the Lord himself that an impassable gulf separates the two parts of the spirit world. The figment of a third place lacks scriptural authority. The Greek *Hades* is used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew *Sheol*. Here our Saviour uses it as the equivalent of *Gehenna*. Perhaps he uses *Gehenna* as the equivalent of *Sheol*; at any rate there is an honest doubt whether in its New Testament use *Hades* means anything else than the place of torment.

The theory of probation after death takes only a one-sided view of the atonement. Its advocates warmly champion the truth of a universal atonement, but they overlook the universal condition which in effect is of equal importance. The atonement is universally efficient but not universally effective, because its conditions are not complied with; it is capable of universal effect, because God's word says it is: "for God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life." To assert, however, that the atonement is of different appropriation, is to limit its universality by other conditions than the one here and everywhere declared. Dr. Hawkins must prove a very difficult problem: that the character of God is double: that there are two standards of right and wrong: that another revelation has been made than is made, or grant that all men are saved by the one atonement and judged by the same standard. For the character of God is always the same. He is none the less an inexorable judge, which alone our fathers supposed, but is at the same time to us a loving Father. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? For a heathen to lie and cheat and steal is sin; the pride of the flesh and lust of the eye are everywhere sin, and sin is everywhere under condemnation of the law. To some is given the law written in the heart, to others engraved on stone. In one case the penalty of the broken law is few stripes, in the other many. It is in both cases the same penalty of the same broken law, but in the one much darkened by the desperately wicked and most deceitful heart. This, it is said, makes degrees in sin; yes, and degrees in the same penalty: such a difference in degrees, for example, as exists between Cain's guilt and the guilt of the dram-seller:

"Accursed was the name of him who slew a righteous man whose soul was ripe for heaven; thrice accursed he whose art malignant sinks a soul in hell."

Now we cannot conceive of such a monstrosity in the judicial dealings of man with man, as would say that one may knowingly violate the law and be pronounced innocent, whereas another doing the same thing is guilty. It has been well said that this theory of probation involves the relation of the atonement to the moral government of God. It involves the doctrine of sin, changes the doctrine of the judgment, impeaches the justice of God, and is perfectly and thoroughly revolutionary of the general understanding of the doctrines of grace.*

It also misrepresents the real character of heathenism. The prophets, poets and apostles of inspiration have described "the abominations of the heathen" (2 Kgs. 16 : 3), "the heathen as sunk into the pit that they have made" (Ps. 9 : 15), and as "walking in the vanity of their mind having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them because of the blindness of their hearts, who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness to work uncleanness and greediness" (Eph. 6 : 19; see also 1 Pet. 4 : 3-6).

The advocates of probation after death plead feelingly for the Gracchi; they have read only the Homers and Virgils and Horaces. They have not read the Juvenals who portray universal infamy and plebeian debauchery. Hear the indictment of Seneca: "We have sinned, and we shall continually do so till the end of time. It is the complaint of our ancestors; it is ours; it will be of our posterity, that morals are perverted, that corruption reigns,"

This sad picture is more exclusively true in barbarous states where there is no refining influence of art and letters. But we are not limited to the past, for missionaries are now constantly repeating the observation of the first missionary to the Gentiles. And, "unless the witnesses are corrupt or incompetent, the case stands proven; that the pagan world is now lying in wickedness." Else being without sin, they are better off without the

*See *The Great Debate*, 56.

Bible than we are with it. This extract from a letter of a missionary of South India of over twenty-five years' experience is pertinent to this topic: "Would you like to know what the most common by far of all the objections the people make to Christianity is? It is this. Your religion will not allow a man to lie, or steal or deceive, or do any of that sort of thing. We can't live without doing them. Your religion is very good, but we cannot follow it."*

The heathen have the law that is written in the heart, and so are a law unto themselves; but by this law they have knowledge of sin, and all they which do such things are worthy of death. Conscience is the voice of this unwritten law, and it condemns them, else there is no significance in the sacrifices and ceremonies of heathen worship.

III. The progressive theology inculcates this theory of probation, or a hope of salvation for the heathen, not because it is expressly set down in scripture, but because it is not expressly cut off by it. Indeed it treats the Bible as a book containing as much error as it certainly does truth. In this emergency it supplements the positive teaching of the Bible by enlarging on the negative revelation by recourse to reason, but without warrant; for the one doctrine of God utters no uncertain sound touching this question of probation after death. It lacks in scriptural authority and spiritual power.

The one thing most clearly taught with respect to the "last times" is retribution for all sin. It is as lasting as the reward of the righteous. The heathen candidly admit their sinfulness, and as clearly feel the condemnation of their guilt. Now it is the doctrine of scripture that all men have a divine call to obedience, and to cease from sin and live unto righteousness. To the heathen it is first immediate, or indirect, through the light of nature: "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Rom. 1 : 21). This argument is expanded in the sermon on Mar's Hill, where natural knowledge of God acquired by reason and grace is shown to offer a direct call: "God

*See *The Great Debate*, 32.

hath made of one blood all nations and hath determined the times before appointed in the bounds of their habitation, that *they should seek the Lord*, if haply they should feel after him, *and if they should find him.*" St. Paul carries this argument one step farther. He argues (Rom. 2 : 15) that the Jews are under condemnation of the law, "for not the hearers of the law are just, but the doers of the law shall be justified." For if at any time the Gentiles without law should do the things of the law,—they although without law are a law unto themselves—they indeed show the law's effect, written in the heart, conscience being a witness. Hence, if the uncircumcised keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision?

If St. Paul opens a possibility for man by nature to do the things of the law, he has, to the contrary, effectually shut off this ideal consummation by pointing to man's real condition: "There is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

Meyer, whom Dr. Stork often called the prince of exegetes, says on this passage that "St. Paul does not wish to prove a justification of the *Gentiles* really occurring as a *result* through the fulfilment of their natural law, but he desires simply to establish the *regulative principle* of justification through the law in the case of the Gentiles.

Real, actual justification by the law takes place neither among Jews nor Gentiles, because in no case is there a complete fulfilment, either, among the Jews, of the revealed law, or, among the Gentiles, of the natural—which in fact is only a substitute for the former, but at the same time forms the limit beyond which their responsibility and judgment cannot in principle go, because they have nothing higher."*

St. Paul explains further how this call is extended to the heathen, in Rom. 10 : 8f: It is by the word of faith which we preach; that if men will confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus, and will believe in the heart that God raised him from the

*On Romans, 90, 91.

dead, they will be saved. There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich, unto all that call upon him. Whosoever then will call upon the name of the Lord will be saved. But a preacher must be sent that they may hear and believe. So, then, faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God. Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went unto all the earth and their words unto the end of the world. So St. Paul inculcates a universal call through the word of God. Gerhard says it is universal, as to God who issues it, but it becomes special through the fault of man both on the part of those who reject it and of those by whose fault the lost word is not always in fact preached in all nations and places (463). Hutter says "God has revealed his word at least three times to the whole world. First, after the creation of the world, in the Adamitic Church. Then, after the deluge, in the house and family of Noah. Then, after the ascension of Christ to heaven, in the departure and dispersion of the apostles in the whole world," (Loc. com. 788).

This is not only the Pauline argument but it is the argument of all scripture, that there is salvation in no other way. The whole world is in self-conscious need of salvation, for the wrath of God is revealed against all iniquity. The apostles were enthusiasts but not fanatics, and, if ever men knew the mind and will of God, they did. St. Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, would have preached the conditions of another method of the appropriation of redemption, if one existed in the councils of eternity. But it was not so revealed by word and spirit.

Yet some Christians in place of the revealed plan of salvation declare their preference, by light of reason, of course, for annihilation, probation, or universalism. In contrast to this sentimentalism hear the denunciations of God's word: "Ye know that ye were Gentiles carried away unto these dumb idols even as we were led. Wherefore I give you to understand that no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost" (1 Cor. 12 : 2). In Eph. 2 : 12 Paul says, "they are without Christ being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." In Gal. 5 : 19-21 he enumerates the works of the flesh

and declares that "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." St. Paul must have made these catalogues of vices mainly from material gathered by observation in his missionary journeys. If the heathen engage in these works as he says they did, and as his successors say they do, we can read their doom: "The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God. Arise, O God; let not man prevail; let the heathen be judged in thy sight" (Ps. 9: 19).

This world of ours *is* a heathen world for two reasons: the heathen resist the word and "the iniquity of the father is visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Him;" and the Church has failed to send this word according to the divine command. If, in these circumstances, as Dr. Hawkins says, the majority of the pagans are not condemned, but saved, it must be because they are not sinners; if so, they are the only sinless people on the planet! Again, if this is true, the church sins in sending them the word which becomes a savor of death unto multitudes. If it is true that the heathen will have a better trial hereafter, the divine commission ought not be incentive enough to induce a man to endanger them when in perfect freedom from doom, for, then, God in his own time and way will save them.

But the effect of the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. If so, then, all to whom it first comes must be under condemnation. If, according to this scripture doctrine, *most* of the heathen are *not* saved, Dr. Hawkins is appalled at the overwhelming obligation resting upon the Church, and at the enormity of her guilt for dereliction of duty. It is humiliating, but let us be honest enough to confess the Church's apathy.

"Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word of my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood shall I require at thine hand" (Ezek. 4: 17, 18).

Surely it is glad tidings of great joy to carry to heathen lands the story of the cross, for, without it, none can be saved.

ARTICLE III.

THE WORK AND THE WORKERS

IN THE GENERAL SYNOD.

By E. J. WOLF, D. D., Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

The essential and specific work of the Christian Church is the preaching of the Gospel, in all the world, to every creature. A universal "Amen" must attest this proposition. And as the gospel of salvation cannot be preached without preachers, all Christians will readily admit that it is the foremost duty of the Church to furnish and equip the men who are to preach repentance and remission of sins among all nations. Whatever calling the Church may have besides, this comes first, and from this duty no congregation or individual believer can claim a release. Christ's teachings are too explicit on this point to be misunderstood, and the force of his conspicuous example, in sending forth early in his own ministry, first twelve, and soon thereafter seventy disciples, to preach the kingdom of God, must be felt wherever there is a desire to obey his authority, and not a mere habit of saying, Lord, Lord.

The apostles or first preachers along with the prophets constitute in a sense the foundation of the Church, Eph. 2 : 20, and this holds true, emphatically, of the Christian ministry in its relation to other departments of church work. The attempt at carrying forward the various agencies of Christian benevolence, while neglecting to make full provision first of all for the preaching of the Word, would be as preposterous a procedure as the endeavor to spring a bridge across a wide river without first putting down the piers and abutments needed to sustain the superstructure. At the base of all evangelical activity and missionary service lies the necessity of producing a ministry commensurate with the extent and requisites of the work. A certain proportion will always subsist between the workers and the work. If the former are inadequate to the latter, then the work will have to be dwarfed to the capacity of the workers. To own

more land than they could cultivate has usually brought farmers into bankruptcy.

It is noticeable, too, that zeal for the spread of the Gospel uniformly characterizes a revived Church. The surest fruit of spiritual quickening, the unmistakable test of a "revival" is the appearance of candidates for the holy office. So inseparably connected with a true church life is the increase of the ministry that ecclesiastical history shows at every important awakening this telling feature, revealing the Church's inward state as clearly as the heart's pulsations indicate the condition of the vital current. Kurtz, in speaking of the spontaneous and rapid multiplication of preachers during the reformation, adds, "When clergymen were wanting, mechanics and knights, even women and young maidens became missionaries. "A very large proportion of the young men who enter the theological seminary, in speaking of their religious experience declare that they received their first impulse to become ministers in a "revival." A dearth of ministers in a denomination, therefore, does not speak well for its present spirituality any more than it promises future prosperity. Congregations as well as individuals, when aglow with the fervor of the new life must find vent for the fire burning within by telling

"to others round

What a dear Saviour they have found."

And when churches moved by the quickening grace within them unite and combine their counsels and their efforts to do the Lord's work in the earth, the very first aim of their organization is to educate and prepare and send forth men to preach Christ. All the larger demoninations of this country showed what spirit was in them when they effected their general organizations and at once took steps for the founding of institutions, which should furnish trained laborers for the vineyard. The Methodists may form an exception. But their course only confirms this principle. They were so zealous in sending forth preachers and so many were ready to be sent that there was great reluctance to lose the time required for a complete education.

A passion for preaching the Gospel is the mark of a living Church. While all cannot personally enter this calling, and experience has demonstrated that a body of men is needed who will make this their vocation, earnest Christians who are themselves prevented from engaging in this noblest of all work will naturally and necessarily put forth their heartiest and best endeavors to have as many others as possible enlist in the blessed service. That this may be most certainly and most wisely effected, that the ministry may be multiplied and qualified to the fullest extent so that supply shall equal demand, has accordingly been the dominant motive in the organization of ecclesiastical bodies in this country and in the founding of literary institutions. But for this powerful incentive it may be a question, whether either churches or colleges would to-day bless our land.

The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States owes its existence very largely to the conviction that organized efforts ought to be made for providing the Church with an adequate ministry. And among the very limited powers which the General body allowed itself was the authority to "devise plans for seminaries of education and missionary institutions." (Art. III, Sec. VII). And the very first committees appointed by the original convention that formed the General Synod in 1820, were, first, one "To form a plan for a seminary of education :

Pastor J. G. Schmucker,
Dr. Lochman,
Dr. Endress,
Pastor Geissenhainer,
Pastor Muhlenberg ;"

and, secondly, one "To form a plan of a Missionary Institute :

Dr. Kurtz,
Pastor J. G. Schmucker,
Pastor D. F. Schaeffer,
Pastor B. Kurtz,
Pastor Reck."

The first committee reported to the next convention, in 1821,

that they found it inexpedient to establish a theological seminary at that juncture (the country was passing through a financial crisis) and advised the project to "be deferred for several years." They further declared their conviction "that after a lapse of several years, the establishment of such a seminary will not only be necessary, but with the aid of God feasible." The Synod also, at the instance of this committee, resolved "that seasonable preparations should be commenced in anticipation of so important an undertaking, viz.:

1.) *That it be made the duty of every minister in our connection to prepare the minds of the members of his congregation on this subject.*

2.) *That arrangements ought to be made at an early day for the establishment of a well-selected and extensive library for the use of the seminary intended to be established."*

Other resolutions in the same line were passed by this first regular convention, one to the effect that the several Synods should "nominate as teachers of certain special branches of theology, particular persons, and to recommend to them certain and suitable text-books and systems of each branch," &c. Another earnestly recommended "to the several synods to send, in the mean time, one or more missionaries to such parts of the country, as in their opinion may stand most in need of them."

At the third convention, in 1823, there was a very slim attendance, the Pennsylvania Synod having withdrawn and "several delegates being absent in consequence of indisposition." Very little business was transacted but a general address to "our several churches" was adopted in which occurs the following passage: "They have heard with feelings of the deepest interest the earnest calls of the children of the Church, and of others, resident on our frontier countries, to have the word of eternal life preached unto them; and have observed with regret that, in many instances no provision could be made to send to them the glad tidings of salvation: they would therefore invite the prayers of the Church to the Lord of the harvest, to raise up and qualify, and send forth many laborers in his harvest. * * *

And especially they would exhort the several synods to perse-

were in their evangelical habit of annually sending missionaries to preach the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

That the zeal of the fathers did not spend itself in mere discussions and lamentations on this subject, appears from the minutes of the next convention, in 1825, from which is taken the following :

"The committee appointed to propose a plan for the establishment of a Theological Seminary, made their report, and after having been discussed and amended, was adopted, as follows, viz.:

"WHEREAS the General Synod regard it as a solemn duty imposed on them by their Constitution, and due from them to their God and to the Church, to provide for the proper education of men of piety and talents, for the Gospel ministry :—Therefore

"Resolved, that the General Synod will forthwith commence, in the name of the Triune God, and in humble reliance on his aid, the establishment of a theological seminary. * * And that in this seminary shall be taught * * the fundamental doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, as contained in the Augsburg Confession."

An agent, Rev. B. Kurtz, was forthwith deputed to go to Europe "to solicit contributions of money and books, for the benefit of the seminary," a Board of Directors was appointed, a Professor elected, subscription books were opened, collecting agents were named and a pastoral address was issued calling upon the people to build up this institution "into an edifice which shall do honor to the liberality of your hearts, to make it commensurate with the wants of our extended Church, and to make it an important and efficient engine in the advancement of the mediatorial reign of the Redeemer."

In less than one year the project was consummated and the seminary at Gettysburg, which still bears the title of "The Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church" stands as the monument of the zeal, wisdom and Christian energy of the founders of the General Synod. The spirit of Christ and of the Apostolic Church animated those men, and with that spirit they also possessed sufficient enlightenment to recognize the two conditions which are indispensable

to securing a ministry commensurate with the possibilities of a Church, namely: organized effort through the united counsels and co-operation of the whole Church, and the obligation of "every minister" of Christ *"to prepare the members of his congregation on this subject."*

Relative to the successful founding of this institution, Dr. Morris in his History of the Seminary (QUART. REV. Vol. VI) says: "The wishes of the brethren had now been accomplished—their ardent expectations were realized,—they had long sighed, and lamented, and prayed, and hesitated—now in the Providence of God an institution was founded, and every one rejoiced in the glorious prospect which the Church had before her." Weak and poor as the Lutheran Church then was, they had now provided for the replenishing of the ministry, and in this way they felt sure that the slow growth, the languishing condition and the sporadic character of the denomination would give way to a better Church life. Their hopes were not disappointed. The establishment of a nursery for preachers was succeeded by a blooming period in the General Synod. This is a well known and significant fact. The reinforcement of the struggling little army resulted in notable triumphs everywhere. Zion experienced a revival of the true kind. A new era came upon Lutheranism.

The supplementary feature of procuring aid for indigent students came in due time, and by the organization of Education Societies a very considerable impetus was added to the cause of ministerial training and through it to the advancement of the Church.

Subsequently provision was made for general missionary and benevolent operations, such as Home and Foreign Missions, Church Extension, the Publication of denominational Literature, &c., the natural and scriptural order being followed, of first raising up the men and then giving them their work and their armor.

Whether this course has been faithfully adhered to in the General Synod or whether the divine order of sustaining and spreading the Church has been virtually, perhaps unwittingly, reversed, will appear in the progress of this paper. A change does seem

to have taken place. While the Formula of Government, Chap. II, Part II, Sec. 4, still makes it the duty of every Church "to provide for the perpetuation of a faithful ministry able to teach," a notable relaxation of interest and effort on this subject has for years been manifest in our public counsels, and while the most strenuous and successful efforts are put forth in other spheres of activity, the work of increasing the ministry has been pushed aside, has in effect dropped out of view. This is a most lamentable revelation, and the most deplorable aspect about it is that so few seem to recognize it. A lukewarmness like that of Laodicea seems on this vital matter to have fallen on the churches represented in the General Synod. The gravest moral delinquency stares them in the face, and the worst of it is, they are satisfied to have it so.

When did we have anything like an energetic discussion of this subject before the General body, on the floor of district Synods, or in the denominational press? The subject came up indirectly at Harrisburg, in 1885, through a resolution in the report of the Board of Home Missions, but when or where in the last fifteen years did it come up on its own merits, as an independent and most important factor of Church work? The district Synods give at their annual sessions some attention to beneficiary education, sometimes by way of attacking it, but, as intimated above, this is at best but a supplementary phase of this great duty, and the interest even in this has seriously declined. Twenty years ago the contributions of large and liberal congregations were wont to be equally divided between Beneficiary Education, Home and Foreign Missions. If either cause had the preference, it was the first one, that being deemed fundamental to the others. Examine now the parochial reports of these churches and with scarce an exception that cause which used to be first has come to be last, neither pastors nor churches having any enthusiasm over it.

What has been done in the last fifteen years to improve the status of theological education? What addition has been made to the libraries? What increase to the teaching force? or to the number of students? What enlargement of the endowment funds? The solitary movement towards any substantial im-

provement was the voluntary proposition, on the part of a devoted and wide-awake divine, to raise the money for a fourth Professorship at the Gettysburg Seminary. He soon found rich men ready to respond and could without doubt have raised a sufficient amount, but the temper ruling in the Church seemed to look with disfavor on the project and it was accordingly suspended. There appears to be a wide-spread feeling that in this department no more need be done for the present. We have actually stopped, content with what we have. For, who amongst us thinks of a forward movement in theological education? Who judges one called for? It is about time that we read on this point Rev. 3 : 17.

Notice over against this apathy the enlarged, liberal and continuous aggression in other departments. What organization, what enthusiasm, what appeals, what responses, what extraordinary strides are being made!

The first day following the organization of the General Synod is occupied with Foreign Missions, the second with Home Missions, the third with Church Extension, the fourth with the meeting of the Publication Society. The General body is absolutely engrossed by these other causes, for even if some day were set later for the consideration of this object, it is useless to attempt the agitation of any vital subject after such an assembly has been on a strain for a week. The working members are tired out, the idle ones have lost interest. Evidently the General Synod is, in these days, not an institution "to provide for the perpetuation of a faithful ministry," maugre the language of its own Formula.

Then, these other benevolent operations are entrusted to Boards constituted of earnest and able men, who meet regularly once a month to attend to their trust. Each of them employs the entire time and services of one or more secretaries, who look after every feature of the work from day to day, who keep their respective interests before the whole Church, who go from Synod to Synod and from congregation to congregation to stimulate and enlarge the cause given into their hands; wide-awake men who are abroad in the land, who have the free use of the press, and who the moment any flagging of interest or decrease of

contributions is apparent are out with their stirring appeals and determined to keep the Church up to the standard. Even a special monthly journal has been founded in which every branch of Church-work except the fundamental one has a distinct department, by which public interest is sought to be kept at white heat.

It may be that our very activity in other spheres has induced a measure of apathy on the supply of the ministry. It is quite common for men to be so absorbed in one pursuit as to become delinquent in others equally important. Any observer at the General Synod may readily find in this the explanation for the fact, that a body which formerly made the increase of ministers its primary function has now rarely either time or inclination to give this subject consideration. But surely this need not be so. Such is the harmony and correlative relation between all branches of activity in the Church that zeal in one direction ought to promote the greater zeal in another, and the more that is done in devising ways and means for missionary and other benevolent operations, the more, in the nature of things, ought we to feel called upon to multiply the men required to conduct these operations. A government intent on a career of conquest will not be so engrossed with the building of vessels, the manufacture of arms and the provision of all the munitions of war as to forget that the primary necessity will be for sailors and soldiers to man the ships and to fight the battles. But this is the very thing we have been doing as a Church. Realizing the mission of Christianity to conquer the world we have of late developed marked activity in planning campaigns, in extending our lines, in erecting fortifications, in occupying advantageous positions, in providing the sinews of war, while scarcely giving a thought to the reinforcement of our little army, which never yet has been strong enough even to hold its beleaguered walls, and which with all its shouting of "feste Burg" has rarely gotten beyond defensive warfare.

The growth of activity in other branches of Church work has been very considerable; encouraging progress has been made in the last twenty years, the increase of liberality has been wonderful, the whole Church has rallied around those causes which

have been specially emphasized and continuously kept before the public, and the people have shown both the will and the ability to provide all the means needed to carry forward these ever-widening interests.

The minutes of the General Synod, which met at Dayton in 1871, show, for instance, the receipt of the Foreign Mission Board for two years to have amounted to \$14,409.70. This Board reported at Harrisburg in 1885 the receipt of \$60,576.72 for the two years covered by their report, an increase of over four hundred per cent. At Dayton the Treasurer's Report for Home Missions showed a total of \$23,063.79 for two years, at Harrisburg the sum of \$54,311.33 for something less than two years, an increase of more than two hundred per cent. At Dayton the Treasurer of the Church Extension fund reported the receipt of \$5,927.47 for the biennium then expired, at Harrisburg \$71,891.02, an increase of nearly fourteen hundred per cent. At Dayton the Publication Society declared the net Capital Stock to be \$24,895.15; fifteen years later at Harrisburg we read: *Net Assets*, \$68,083.91, a gain of nearly three hundred per cent. At the former convention \$576.00 were collected in aid of the Society, at the latter it reported a donation of \$6000.00 from its treasury to the various Church Boards.

Agitation, organization, zealous endeavors on the part of secretaries, Boards, Church papers and pastors, have yielded results over which the whole Church has gratefully rejoiced.

But where in all this time has any perceptible advance been made in filling up the gaps in our ministry? What solitary indication can be pointed to that will show during this period any improvement at this most vital point? Can our theological institutions reveal in any respect one step of progress? We are standing still. Aggregate the number of students in our theological seminaries and it is doubtful whether they show an increase of one. (Quite recently the applicants for beneficiary aid have multiplied, but the seminaries can not as yet show the results of this). Families of wealth and culture abound among us, but how many have been led to feel sufficient interest on this point to consecrate their own sons to the holy office? Men

who give by the hundred or even thousand in support of missions appear to have neither heart nor conscience on the matter of giving their sons to this work. Large congregations which send annually very generous contributions to the respective Boards, have in twenty-five years, some in fifty years, not furnished a single candidate for orders—and they appear to have no compunctions of spirit, no sense of humiliation over it. They are but a part of the general current, they share the general obtuse consciousness that missions are everything, the providing of missionaries nothing. Fields of work are most important, never mind about the workmen. Make up the trains, all aboard! engineers and conductors will doubtless turn up before we get very far!

Is this a mere jeremiad? Is the writer a pessimist? Face the figures. Look, if you can, at our scale of progress in filling up the ranks. According to Stall's *Lutheran Year-Book* the General Synod in 1877, numbered 812 ministers, in 1885 the clerical roll was increase to 866, making a net gain of 54 preachers in nine years! An average of 6 men per year added during that time to the effective force of the whole General Synod!! Perhaps "effective" gain is putting it too strongly. Deducting the deaths and adding the new men, the roll was swelled from 812 to 866 in nine years, but those who in the mean time became superannuated or for any reason dropped out of active service, are of course continued on the ministerial register, making it quite doubtful whether the General Synod really had a gain of 54 men in active duty during nine years, or 6 in one year.

It is to be hoped that the reader will pause here and take in as far as he can the import of these portentous figures. When, at this rate, will we occupy "the immense field" that lies open to us? When, with this showing to back us, will we plant our standard in all the important centres of the west? When, with such a record, will we anglicise the vast immigrant population that only needs a Lutheran shepherd to be brought into the Lutheran fold? When will we reinforce our struggling little company beyond the seas—where death keeps reducing the number, as fast as we succeed in increasing it? Is it a wonder,

notwithstanding the shame of it, that the Foreign Board after keeping in the Journal a standing notice for years—"Three men wanted for the Foreign field"—have not yet found even this small number of missionary recruits? Is it a wonder, notwithstanding the shame of it, that the devoted brother Day must continue to toil solitary and alone on the African Coast, in spite of the unnatural character of such an isolation and the long-continued appeals for an assistant.

Not a man can really be spared to go to Africa, India, or our own frontier. Our charges in the old fields, long ago established, are increasing more rapidly than the pastors to serve them, and unless these old churches are to be abandoned for a time or indefinitely, it is under present circumstances preposterous to send missionaries into new fields. Look at some more figures. The main strength of the General Synod, the old and settled portion of the country embraced within its bounds, lies in the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania. During the nine years that witnessed an increase of 54 ministers in the entire body, the seven synods comprised in these two states show an increase of 55 pastoral districts. Thus the old territory in two States occupied long ago, alone required for its charges 55 additional laborers, when the whole body furnished only 54 of all qualities, to be employed in 38 states and 10 territories and the missionary fields of Asia and Africa. The whole body came within one of producing just enough additions to the ministry to supply the churches waiting for them in Pennsylvania and Maryland alone. *And certainly the call for additional workers is less urgent in Pennsylvania and Maryland than in any other state of the Union.* The need for more laborers here bears no comparison to that which exists in a score of other states. But whence are to come the laborers for the immense and ever-widening harvest? How is it possible, without such a ratio of increase as has never been thought of heretofore, to make any advance whatever? * Unless

*Doubtless the large majority of the accessions to the ministry are called immediately to fields in these two States and the adjoining state of Ohio. And, including the few students that hail from New York, New Jersey and the South, it is these few states that supply almost the entire additions to the ministerial roll. If the General Synod has in all the states west of

precedence be once more given by the Church to the cause which God puts first, unless we begin to observe the law of proportion and devote our greatest energy to the point which most needs it, every other cause is in turn bound to languish. Just here has always been the salient and glaring weakness of English Lutheranism. City after city and point after point have been lost, simply for want of qualified men to enter into open doors. And the stereotyped lament of the Home Missionary Secretaries, ever since there exists such an office, has been "if we only had the men!" The lament has been repeated so often that it no longer attracts attention. Without a ministry bearing some proportion to the work, a feeling of impotence has largely swayed the Church, and we have inevitably fallen behind, like a team on the road, whose master attempts with two horses to drag a burden that requires twice or four times the horse-power at his command.

The consciousness of our inability to compass more than the smallest fraction of the work that might be done with sufficient workmen, impairs very largely even that measure which is being done. No man can have the spirit needed for the best endeavor and the highest success, who is weighed down with the feeling that whatever he may attempt, an enormous portion of the work must remain unaccomplished and the brightest opportunities be forfeited. The recent record of our Home Missions and our

Ohio 12 candidates in course of preparation, the fact is unknown in the east. It is known that whole synods have not a single one. Money collected in one western synod for the beneficiary fund was some time ago offered to Gettysburg, where it was hoped young men could be found to whom it might be appropriated. With all that portion of the Church doing practically nothing, and all the rest not doing enough to make up losses and to occupy new organizations and new districts in Pennsylvania and Maryland, is there a human possibility of building up the English Lutheran Church in the great west! There can be no justification in keeping these startling facts from the light of day. It is not likely that our neighbors will take them up in order to concentrate reproach on the General Synod. There would be no occasion for envy if the Council could offer a better showing in its English work. But as long as less than half a dozen English organizations represent that body west of Indiana, it would be rather ungracious for any one from that quarter to charge us with being sinners above all the Lutherans.

Church Extension, encouraging as it is, would have been written in more glowing colors but for the paralyzing consciousness that with our scant ministerial force it is impossible to make any substantial advance. Oppressed by this incubus, enthusiasm is quenched, courage depressed, faith is enervated, liberality checked. By the very grandeur of a prospect which they feel impotent to seize our people are disheartened and unnerved. Should you ask half-a-score of reapers to harvest a thousand-acre field, you may depend on it, they would shoulder their sickles and return to their homes. Something like this is what is expected to be done by an extremely limited number of Lutheran ministers.

It is evident from the above figures that this disproportion of the workers to the work is every year growing larger, and that we are becoming less and less capable of seizing our opportunity and meeting our responsibility. If the General Synod had not a sufficient body of ministers in 1877, then the relative deficiency in 1885 must be far greater, for the net increase within the whole Church is less by one than the increase of pastorates in two states alone, and with the immense multiplication of opportunities all over the west, not a man is left over to go to the front. Every soldier is required to guard the capitol, where then is the army to march out against the mighty foe. Every man sent to the front make a drain upon the strength needed at home. You cannot in the present situation throw forward a force of missionaries without exposing the base of supplies. It is impossible with our feeble numbers to occupy new positions and at the same time hold and properly strengthen the old ones. Infinite demoralization and disaster overtake the old churches which are left unsupplied by the removal of the most efficient pastors to mission fields. Who has not been most painfully impressed by observing this fact! Notice the parochial reports at synod. How many are careful to apologize for the melancholy figures with such phrases as "this is only for half the year," "the report covers only two months," "the pastor took charge but a month ago." Some have no report at all. They were vacant through the whole year. There is nothing to report. Ah! yes there is much to report, Not only a failure to do any-

thing for the spread of the kingdom, but a very serious decline, the falling away of many, and a large increase of worldliness and ungodliness, requiring many years to recover what has been lost.

It is a legitimate question whether under these painful circumstances it is worth the while to be exploring new places in which to plant Lutheran churches. Our Home missionaries often speak of their readiness to develop certain contiguous points where there are good prospects for starting a new organization, but they justly recoil from the undertaking, because they know in advance that men can not be provided to take charge of them. And when the secretaries come to the synods with their glowing reports of the vastness of the field, and name the scores of towns and cities that are waiting for the bread of life at our hands, they simply appal and overwhelm us. In answer to a recent statement by the Western secretary that there are "ONE THOUSAND OTHER OPENINGS," we can only cry, O Lord, how long! It is not the poverty or penuriousness of the Church that forbids any earnest attempt to take possession of these places for the Master. The people will provide the money needed for every mission that is properly manned. They have done so heretofore—at St. Louis, Chicago, Denver and other places. All that was asked for was in due time forthcoming. They will do so again. Select your city, appoint a missionary who commands their confidence, and the means for support will be found. But unless in this age of invention you have found machinery to take the place of workmen in the pulpit, we might as well abandon the business of founding missions and building churches, until we see some earnest movement toward raising up and qualifying sufficient laborers to do the work for which missions are founded and churches built. It is, to say the least, not business to continue what has been for years the practice of the Church. And it is a wonder that intelligent business men have not pointed out the error of this procedure.

But we dare not discontinue the benevolent operations for which the Church was instituted. We dare not do less than we have been doing in the cause of missions. The Head of the Church will spew us from his mouth if we content ourselves

with what has been done. "Forward," is the command. "Into all the earth," is our marching order. A church cannot live, it is no church, if it be not active in missionary and all benevolent work. But let us go to the root of the tree. Let us pray like souls that are in earnest for laborers to be sent into the harvest. These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

And this is a work that can be done. There is no excuse for dereliction here. Hundreds upon hundreds of men are found in our churches who are capable of becoming preachers. Many of the foremost divines among the Baptists and Episcopalians have entered the pulpit from the bar and from other professions, and among the Lutheran laymen there are numbers who might become most effective preachers of Christ. What warrant have we for confining the recruiting of the ministry to our present inadequate system? When was the divine call restricted to young men?

There may be a limit to the Church's capacity to raise funds and occasions may arise—though this is doubtful—where a most promising project must be declined because the means for its support can absolutely not be obtained, but there is no reason except that of wicked indifference why our seminaries should not graduate one hundred students each year, instead of an average scarcely above fifteen. Not circumstances beyond our control, not providential barriers, are chargeable with the deplorable result, but worldliness, selfishness and an astonishing indifference touching the most vital work of Christianity. The only possible defense that can be thought of is, that we have been so occupied with other branches of activity as to overlook the main one. We have been reversing the order of nature. We have acted as if wiser than God and as if we were making an improvement upon his methods.

Now, as the fruits of our misdoing appear let them be followed with true repentance, with a sincere change of mind and a change of conduct. Let ministerial education come once more to the front. Let the principal work of the Church again receive the principal attention. Whatever be the rich prospects that open to our view in Kansas, Nebraska, India or elsewhere,

let it be understood that so long as the men are not here to make them realities, these prospects are but the illusory *mirage* of the desert. It is not new openings that we need, not new territory to be held, not new ships of war to bombard the strongholds of sin, but *an army of occupation*.

Let then the first working-day of the General Synod be devoted to the burning question of reinforcing the ministry. No change of Constitution is necessary and the "Order of Business" will appear more in harmony with the nature of things when this subject is made the first "special order." Let the District Synods realize that no question of equal importance can possibly engage their attention, and that it is for them to help and not to hinder all true men who offer themselves for the service. Let pastors recognize the very solemn relation of their work to this cause, and ponder the comparison between ministers who have multiplied themselves ten or twenty fold and those who have never brought another into the office. Let congregations realize that the first obligation devolving on them is to send out from their midst men who shall preach also to others that gospel which they possess. Yes, let it be pressed on their conscience that there is no surer nor sadder proof of the spiritual torpor and death of a church, than its failure for years and years to bring forth a single minister of Christ. Let them be made to feel that whatever may be the outward strength of a congregation, it must wither under the divine curse if in this matter it come not to the help of the Lord against the mighty. A community of citizens who view as idle spectators the progress of a war, whose results they expect to share but for whose battles they never contribute a soldier, would be proscribed by the government. And can Heaven smile on a community of Christians animated by no better principle? Finally, let parents and especially mothers come to know what claims the Lord that bought them has upon their sons, and what base ingratitude it is for them to withhold a son from the highest and most honorable service of Him, who gave his only-begotten to the lowest and bitterest service for them! Instead of it being no one's duty in particular to see to this matter, let it be made the duty of every one individually and of every organization, congrega-

tional and synodical. Let pressure be brought to bear upon every part and portion of the Church, and importunate and universal prayer ascend to the source of all supply, and an impulse will be given to the prosperity of Zion, such as the English Lutheran Church has never before known. Let us undertake great things and great things will be accomplished, especially if we begin at the right place, where God begins, where the General Synod began, in building up and filling up institutions charged with the duty of providing the Church with a competent and ample ministry.

It is hardly just to close this paper without any allusion to the sad anomaly of having a number of ministers who fail to find employment, while yet every department of the Church is suffering and has always been suffering from a serious destitution in the holy office. This is a problem so delicate to handle and surrounded with such painful and perplexing circumstances that few men have the courage to write about it over their own signature. It is a serious question whether the fault lies with the pastoral charges, or with the preachers who are without charges. Perhaps, in many cases it is nearly equally divided between both parties. With a profound sympathy for brethren who are out of labor and therefore out of bread, the writer has interested himself to the point of officiousness in trying to secure fields for such ministers, but almost without exception these brethren have proven, either from choice or necessity, singularly fastidious as to the character of the field they would serve. Either they could not or would not serve any charge, unless it was constituted of a given number of churches, unless it lay in a particular locality, had a favorable climate, and a certain amount of advantages. And, while recoiling from the thought of wounding his humblest brother, the writer feels, in justice to the truth, constrained to say that for a minister who is willing to go anywhere, and who is willing and able to labor in any and every kind of a field, a pastoral charge can certainly be found somewhere in a Church that unhappily abounds in destitute districts.

But certainly no one will seriously claim that efforts for the

increase of the active ministry must not be intensified until places are found for those now inactive. The very number of the inactive is a powerful argument for increasing the effective force. If the total of all classes of our ministry number but 910, and a considerable number of these are without charges, then the number of laborers is that much smaller than appears in our statistics, and the duty becomes the more imperative to make a vigorous forward movement in raising up reapers to gather the whitening harvest.

ARTICLE IV.

THE FINAL JUDGMENT.

By PROF. L. A. FOX, D. D., Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

"The New Theology recognizes the necessity of a restatement of belief in eschatology, or the doctrine of the Last Things." With these words one of the ablest advocates of the new movement in theology introduces his discussion of one of its chief characteristics. Not merely the doctrine of probation after death, around which the battle has been fought for several years, but those of the resurrection, Christ's second advent and the final judgment also are to be restated.

The challenge for a new study of these doctrines is not in itself objectionable. It is not to be neglected. Dead conservatism and indolence may shrink from it. They may ask sneeringly, Is nothing to be considered settled? They may attempt to ignore it. But earnest, honest thought is not to be refuted by sneers nor stopped by our assumed indifference. Radical changes often win because the old, relying too much upon the fact of possession, refuses or neglects to meet the new in fair and free discussion. Truth never loses when brought out into clear light. If there is truth in the New Theology it should be recognized and incorporated with the old systems. If the old theology is better, let it be brought forward again and placed by the side of the new that the world may see clearly the difference and make a more intelligent and positive choice.

The demand in our age for a new Theology is not a matter of surprise. Many old sciences are being recast. We have a new Chemistry. We are promised a new Psychology. A call is being made for a new Political Economy. Geology and Biology are new sciences. Many new facts, related in a greater or less degree to religion, have been brought out by science and criticism. The theological importance of many of these facts has not been carefully determined, and they have an exaggerated significance in the public mind. In many quarters it is thought that the old orthodoxy must be abandoned and a wholly new system of faith must be moulded to suit the wants of our enlightened period. The New Theology is by no means as radical as many suppose, nor as closely connected with the recent scientific discoveries as is generally believed, yet it does propose important changes and professes a closer relation to modern science than the old systems. It is in some degree a response to the call of the age. The friends of the old systems cannot decline the challenge for the new study. The earnest, devout, able and, in great part, orthodox men who make it in the name of the new movement, deserve respect. A profound and reverent and truth-loving study of the points in dispute, under the light of the present, must have some good results. President Noah Porter says, "If theology as a science is to a large extent constituted of elements derived from philosophy on the one side and criticism on the other, then as these sciences are perfected theology itself must inevitably change and change for the better."

But it may be asserted without seeming to prejudice the issue, that much of the popular expectation will not be realized. This is evident, first, because the new scientific facts affect theology almost exclusively in the department of apologetics. In this there has been only a change of disputed points. Some old difficulties have been removed and new ones created. The greater part of the old evidences are as valid as ever. Dogmatic Theology, with which the New Theology is concerned, is governed chiefly by Biblical criticism. "The demands of the age," as Dr. Munger uses it in his justification of the new movement, means a growing liberalism, a broader idea of humanity and its relations, but these demands must be subordinated to the Scrip-

tures. True theology does not ask, What do men think? but, What does God teach? The sciences have been changed because new facts have necessitated changes of theories. New fields have been opened. New instruments of observation have been invented. New methods have been employed. But the field of theology remains the same. We have no new Bible. We have a little better textual criticism and some archæological investigations which help us to understand somewhat better certain scriptural statements. But neither has been clearly enough established to be used extensively in theological study. As a result of criticism we have the New Version which has not won anything like universal favor among scholars. But even if accepted, very few doctrines would need any modification whatever. Criticism and research are respectively correcting themselves. The Tübingen school has receded from many of its first conclusions, and this illustrates the general tendency.

Another reason for the opinion that the popular expectation will not be met is, that it is based upon sweeping inductions. One of the great sources of error is illegitimate induction. A fact is announced, and even before verification men rush to conclusions. Cullen says, "There are more false facts current in the world than false theories." When facts have been established, unwarranted inferences are drawn. How often has Christianity been supposed to be undermined! Promises are made in the line of the wishes of men, and they persuade themselves that the end is realized. "*Quae volunt sapiunt, et nolunt sapere quae vera sunt.*" So when a strong point is made against one of the old systems it is thought that they have all alike been utterly demolished. It must be remembered also that there is a Lutheran theology, and if the Calvinistic be overthrown the Lutheran still stands. If the Church has modified its view of infant salvation it does not follow, as sometimes seems to be inferred, that it will come to accept the doctrine of probation after death.

To be correct in our estimate of the New Theology and fair in our discussion of any of its points we must remember that it professes to be "only a movement." Its views are undergoing important changes. It is a name that marks lines of investigation and methods of study rather than fixed results. It must

be remembered also that it exists in orthodox churches. The Unitarians, for manifest reasons, regard it very favorably, yet its advocates claim "no sympathy with those who do not walk the one way." In some points the two approximate, yet they must be regarded as distinct. There is a rationalizing tendency and the influence of Rationalism may be observed, yet the leaders and abettors are not Rationalists.

One of the chief difficulties of the discussion seems to lie in the want of a clear understanding as to the authority by which the questions shall be decided. Both parties appeal to the Scriptures. But is there an agreement as to the nature of these Scriptures? Is the Bible God's book, a revelation from God, or is it a human record of revelation? Is it inspired, or is it a human production? Is its authority ultimate? If the principle of interpretation, now so familiar to the public ear—"as God gives us light"—be applied to the Scriptures as it is to a creed, we have a wide open door for divergence. The New Theology weakens further this appeal to the Scriptures by its "claim for itself of a somewhat larger and broader use of the reason than has been accorded to theology." (Munger). Reason is explained as the full exercise of our nature which embraces the intuitions, the conscience, the susceptibilities, *i. e.* man's whole inner being. It will not be easy to determine under this "broader use" just to what extent reason may decide points of doctrine.

We are concerned in this article with the authority in regard to questions in eschatology. Shall the final appeal be made to the Scriptures, or the general Christian consciousness, or reason? Shall the restatement be made because the New Version requires it? If true criticism has proven that the old proof texts had been misunderstood, the modifications of the old doctrine must be made. But the work of the revisers needs examination. The general Christian consciousness is not sufficiently definite to be a safe or an accessible tribunal. Schleiermacher's theology makes us afraid of it. The demands of the age cannot be ultimate. We allow them no authority until we know whence they come. We know that public opinion is often hearty and that the current of thought often changes rapidly. Many books five years old are out of date. The demands of to-day may not be

made a few years hence, but truth does not change. Reason must apprehend but it cannot limit the sphere of doctrine. There are many things which it cannot comprehend. He would be a poor deity whom reason could measure. We find boundaries on every side beyond which we cannot pass. God's ways are past finding out. We have no satisfactory explanation of sin. If we had speculated we should have pronounced evil impossible. We would have proposed different methods of government from those we find. Until we can comprehend God and his eternal plans reason must be humble in its speculations. We are inclined to forget the impotence of reason. Mansel's *Limits of Religious Thought* is a good book for our age when read with discrimination. Reason transcends its sphere when it attempts to forecast the facts of the last times. Eschatology is eminently Biblical. Without the Scriptures we are not sure that there will be any subsequent life. In depreciating the authority of the Bible we weaken the very ground on which we stand. We must be sure that we have the very words of God or we are left in great uncertainty.

Our view of the last times is determined in some measure by our conception of God's relation to the world. The New Theology emphasizes the Fatherhood of God. This may be well enough in opposition to the Sovereignty of God as taught by Calvin and Knox. Calvin's God filled us with awe and made us bow with a certain profound reverence but failed to secure our love. He was a God who made, even as Calvinists admitted, dreadful decrees. We were held off at a great distance and never could realize in him the father falling upon the neck of the returning prodigal and kissing him. In the Calvinistic systems the paternal side of God's character was not put in its proper place. But the New Theology errs as seriously on the opposite side. It overlooks the fact that God is a sovereign as well as a father. Take this as a specimen of its reasoning: "No father says to his children, 'You have a chance; it shall be fair; I will not be hard with you; it will last just so long; if you do not meet the test you may go your own way.' It is, indeed, possible that in a desperate exigency of family-life a father might be forced to say this, but it is not in such guise that a wise and

tender parent presents himself to his children. As little is it the aspect of the Heavenly Father before men." (Freedom of Faith). True, no human father deals thus with his children because he is head of a family only. The children are born with the spirit of loyalty, but men are born at enmity with God and cannot be treated as children. The father is ruler in a very small circle, but God's scepter is over worlds. Human parents becoming rulers of a nation must in official relations change the attitude towards their children. Brutus, the elder, condemning his own traitorous sons and witnessing the execution, according to the legend, may have carried the principle to an extreme but yet he serves to illustrate it. As a father God may have no need of a final judgment but if he is a sovereign there are sufficient reasons for it.

The Scriptures teach no less clearly and fully God's sovereignty than his fatherhood. "Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all." (1 Chron. 29 : 11). "All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth : and none can stay his hand or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Dan. 4 : 35). "Our God is in the heavens; he hath done whatsoever he pleased." (Ps. 115 : 3). "Now unto the king eternal, incorruptible, invisible, the only God." (1 Tim. 1 : 7). These are only a few of the passages teaching a natural sovereignty or kingdom founded upon the rights of creation. The kingdom of grace is based upon the natural kingdom. It is God's scheme of restoring to its place in the eternal kingdom that portion that had become perverted through sin. Over this kingdom Christ is sovereign. He claimed to be a king. "My kingdom is not of this world." "Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am king." (John 17 : 33, 35, 37). For the better administration of this kingdom he has been invested with universal authority. "All authority hath been given to me in heaven and on earth." (Matt. 28 : 18). "And made him (Christ) to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places far above all rule and authority and power and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world (or age) but also in

that which is to come; and he put all things in subjection under his feet and gave him to be head of all things to the Church." (Eph. 1 : 21, 22). "In him ye are made full who is the head of all principality and power." (Col. 2 : 10). "He must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet." "When he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him." (1 Cor. 15 : 25, 27). Both as the Head of the Church and as Lord over all he will judge the world.

It is somewhat difficult to gather just what the New Theology holds as to the Last Judgment. It does not appear to have fully developed its doctrine, but we can determine the trend of its opinions. "It holds to judgment as involved in the development of moral character." "We are all the while rendering account to the laws within and without; we are all the while undergoing judgment and receiving sentence of acquittal or condemnation. It does not follow, however, that because judgment is drawn forward into this world from the next that it is confined to this world. Great moral laws have universal sweep. Instead of confining judgments to the future, we take it out of time-relations and make it a fact of eternity. It is ever an on-going process. Conduct is always reaching crises and entering upon its consequences. It may be cumulative in degree and reach crises more and more marked; it may at last reach a special crisis which shall be *the* judgment when the soul shall turn to the right or left of eternal destiny." (Freedom of Truth, p. 341). The old theology is charged with weakness because it "arbitrarily transfers the most august and moving features of God's moral government to a future world, thus placing the wide and mysterious gulf of time and death between actions and their motives." "Judgment is a constantly recurring crisis." "The true substance of judgment is to be sought in subjective moral conditions, and not in external governmental arrangements." (Do., p. 339). "We are to think of the Judgment not as an *event* limited to a specific 'day' but as a *process* which runs its course throughout the whole existence of the responsible subjects of law." (Whiton, Gospel of the Resurrection).*

*The *Andover Review* has given forth no clear expression on the doc-

this doctrine there is to be no general judgment or last day but crises to individuals occurring in the changes in personal history; no event but a mere process in individual character. In this doctrine the New Theology and the more conservative Unitarianism are very closely related if not identical.

The arraignment of the old doctrine is wrong. The old theology taught that there are judgments in this world and that sometimes final judgments are pronounced. It taught the possibility of sinning unto death. The sin against the Holy Ghost was made prominent enough to be practically influential, and every pastor has been called often to decide great perplexities and remove fears on account of it. People were so often warned against grieving away the Spirit lest he cease to strive with them that it became one of the platitudes of the pulpit. If the old theology drew additional motives from the future life it followed the Great Preacher. "It is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not thy whole body go into hell." "And be not afraid of them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." As long as men believe in future retribution and a great day of judgment, though death does intervene, they find in that faith a powerful motive.

Finality in character does not exhaust the scriptural idea of judgment. The new doctrine confounds fact and decision based

trine of the final judgment. In Vol. IV. there is an editorial on eschatology in which there is a very brief discussion of the fact and principle of judgment, but the purpose of the editor did not lead him to state his opinion on the points under consideration in this article. Old orthodoxy can subscribe his language so far as it goes but still will want a more explicit statement: "Predictions of the future carry us on to the day of judgment as the time when the consummation of the gospel will be accomplished. Then the destiny of men will be irrevocably fixed. It will be the final crisis for the human race. Whatever may be the decisive point in time for individuals this is unquestionably represented as the crisis for humanity as a whole under the gospel. The first advent of Christ was unto salvation. The second advent is unto judgment and victory." "We are now emphasizing the fact as one of the most evident in the scriptural teaching that the day of judgment—the second coming of Christ—is the final and supreme crisis for the human race."

on the fact. The fact of a murder is not the same thing as the verdict of a jury. The character of man may become fixed in this life, or in death, or possibly in the life to come, but that is quite a different thing from the judgment of God. The one is man's own act; the other is God's decision.

The new doctrine, founded upon the idea of the fatherhood of God, fails to comprehend the great purposes of the final judgment.

The last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* gives us "advanced thought" on religious subjects. We have this thought on the final judgment in the article on Eschatology, written by Rev. A. S. Allen. He says: "There are two distinct methods of treatment of these difficult subjects. In the philosophy of them we meet the ever recurrent antagonism between the Platonic and Aristotelian systems." "The New Testament itself discloses two entirely different eschatological methods. The one is moral, spiritual, idealist, employing outward forms only as symbols, viewing the future rather in regard to development of character than as a mode of existence. This is the Christian as contrasted with the Jewish method. The other follows the natural tendency of Jewish thought. It is literal, material, sensuous. It delights in chronological arrangements of the unknown future, and topographical arrangements of the unseen world. This method aims in all its representations at abrupt catastrophe and at a consummation depending on startling and supernatural surprises. These distinctive tendencies appear within the New Testament most prominently—the one in the fourth gospel and the other in the Apocalypse. The Pauline theology exhibits them side by side, showing their discordance in the absence of all attempt on the part of the apostle to reconcile. This is seen in his treatment of the resurrection. The same discordance is observable in his treatment of the judgment and of the end of the world." The more orthodox part of the friends of the New Theology may not endorse a part of the language of Mr. Allen, but their fundamental idea of the judgment is the same.

That there is any discordance between a spiritual development and a consummation attended by startling supernatural mani-

festations, not only Paul, but also John and Christ failed to see. They all three teach both, without any attempt to reconcile them. Christ teaches the one in the parable of the leaven and the other in the parable of the net. If the symbolism of the net must set aside its plain teaching why not the symbolism of the leaven? Christ teaches the moral, spiritual influence of the Spirit when he compares it to wind, and he taught the disciples to look for the startling and supernatural baptism which they received at Pentecost. He said that the kingdom of heaven comes without observation, but he foretold also the destruction of Jerusalem in language that strongly suggests the startling and supernatural. Our theories ought to conform to the Scriptures—the Scriptures must not be strained and perverted to meet our theories. Gradual development that ends in marked consummations is not without analogies in nature, history and common life. Silent forces culminate in the earthquake. Poisons, operating quietly, suddenly reveal themselves in epidemics. The forces had long been developing that broke forth in the French Revolution. The undergraduate develops intellectually and morally, passes his final examination, and on Commencement day receives the bachelor's crown. We see—the difficulty is in the supernatural, for to modern thought that is almost impossible with Almighty God.

There are different words in the Scriptures translated judgment, and there are different kinds of judgment taught. Sometimes judgment has the sense of opinion. "But that ye be perfected in the same mind and in the same judgment." (1 Cor. 1 : 10). Sometimes it is used in the sense of punishments. "Thus will I execute judgments." "When I send my four sore judgments upon Jerusalem, the sword and the famine and the noisome beast and the pestilence." (Ez. 30 : 19 and 14 : 21). "In one hour are thy judgments come." (Rev. 18 : 10). "For the time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God." (1 Pet. 4 : 17). It occurs very often in the sense of an official judicial sentence, and often also in that of a decision. If it is used at all in reference to subjective changes or crises in moral character, it is the rarest of its uses.

The New Theology adopts the arguments drawn from nature

for a future judgment. These may here be briefly repeated. The fact of accountability grows out of freedom, and accountability implies judgment. Conscience is a court in our own nature that points to a higher court and foretokens a judgment in the life to come. True, conscience might have been given as a guide to a safer life ending in the grave, but then how is it that its voice is heard in things so remote from utility, and why so much stronger in the presence of death? If there is no other judgment there is no sufficient reason for this inner tribunal, and our freedom is a delusion.

That there is a judgment after death is the universal voice of man. All nations have believed it. We have it in the ancient mythology, in the ancient philosophy, and in other forms in other ages. In every stage of culture, from the most enlightened to the most savage, there has been some form of expression of universal instinct.

There are wrongs in society that call for rectification. There is manifold injustice and there are no adequate remedies found. Our sense of justice, implanted by our Maker, asks for relief for the wronged and oppressed. Emerson in one of his essays sneers at the argument based on this fact. He thinks that all demands are fully met by the law of Compensation. But that was the opinion of a recluse and sentimental pantheist. The argument is not set aside by ridicule. John Stuart Mill, an incomparably superior philosopher, thought that the facts of the world warranted the conclusion that God failed to carry out the best part of his plan. Schopenhauer would have had no peace for his Pessimism if Compensation was such a sovereign remedy. It is not simply that many of the wicked are rich and many of the pious are poor, as Emerson says we argue, but that justice is not done. Multitudes suffer for wrongs they never committed. The guilty often escape. The martyr dies while the tyrant mocks his dying agonies. There is no tribunal this side of the grave that rectifies these wrongs. Natural laws fail to carry the balance even.

These arguments prove only a judgment—not a general judgment in the last day. But there are demands for a judgment that a private, personal judgment does not satisfy.

There are wrongs in the world that call for public correction. Public offenses may not be removed by private satisfactions. Assuming a personal God, speculation has so little to object to the Christian conception of a general judgment that if it were not taught in the Scriptures it must supply the lack. And from this view we may rise to the higher one: that it is not enough that the character of the individual be fixed, or that he should know that it is fixed, but it is due his fellow-men, with whom he stands in mysterious solidarity, and to the universe that they should know that it is fixed. A general judgment would serve well this purpose.

The New Theology claims to be the old, the Greek theology revived. The modern view of the final judgment is wholly new. The early fathers were not agreed as to many points in regard to the last times, but there was but one faith in respect to the judgment. They all* thought that it was to be an "event," a catastrophe at the close of the world's history. "All were at one—men of the Johannic school, as Polycarp and Papias—of the Pauline, as Ignatius and Clement of Rome—of the Petrine, as Barnabas—of that of James, as Hermas and Hegesippus—all were at one as to the fact that a return of Christ was to be expected when he should raise the dead and hold the judgment.

*Prof. A. V. G. Allen would make Clement of Alexandria an exception. "The opinion once so generally held, especially among Jewish Christians, and still prevailing among the Christians in the West in Clement's own time, that Christ was soon to return to make a second personal coming in the flesh, in order to introduce a millennium for the faithful and to take vengeance upon his adversaries, is to his mind irrational, for it contradicts his supreme conviction that the essential spiritual Christ is here already in the fulness of his exalted might and has already begun to witness his triumph at the right hand of the Father. The judgment of the world is not viewed as a fixed event in the distant future, but as now forming an integral part of the process by which the human race is educated under its divine Instructor." (*Continuity of Christian Thought*, p. 66). Prof. A. admits that Clement expressed himself sparingly on all subjects pertaining to the last times, and it is at least probable that he saw in the *Stromata* nothing more than the reflexion of his own sentiments. Clement was not a systematic thinker, and there are many heterogeneous ideas thrown together in his writings. His *Stromata* is particularly a chaotic mass of truth and error drawn from Greek philosophers and Christian sects.

and when the Church should be perfected by the separation from the evil." (Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, D. 1, Vol. 1, p. 143). Neander says of the first three centuries: "They could conceive of it no otherwise than this, the struggle between Church and State would endure till triumph was brought about from without by the return of Christ to judgment." (Church History, Vol. 1, p. 650). Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen and Origen, as well as Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine believed in a sudden, visible return of Christ to judgment. The same faith was transmitted through the succeeding centuries to the Reformation. Peter DeOliva in the thirteenth century taught that there are great epochs in the evolution of the kingdom of God, but we must distinguish a threefold manifestation of Christ in the history of the world—the first and last visible. Militz in the fourteenth century thought the angels who gather the tares are the faithful preachers of the Gospel, were men, but in other respects he held the common doctrine.

The Evangelical Church accepted the ancient faith. The Augsburg Confession says: "The same Christ shall openly come again to judge the quick and the dead." More fully in another article: "Also they teach that in the consummation of the world Christ shall appear to judge and shall raise up all the dead." The Belgic Confession (1561) says, "We believe according to the Word of God that when the time appointed by the Lord is come and the number of the elect complete our Lord Jesus Christ will come from heaven corporally and visibly, as he ascended, with great glory and majesty to declare himself Judge of the quick and the dead, burning this old world with fire and flame to cleanse it." In slightly changed language there is perfect unanimity among all the creeds where the doctrine is mentioned at all.

It is only in very recent times that we hear of any other opinion. The Rationalists first desired only a general, indefinite statement. Afterwards came the idea of Schelling: that "the history of the world is the world's judgment." Then there is a late view, analogous to Schelling's, that the last judgment is now in process. Closely akin to this is the doctrine of some premil-linarians. Dr. Seiss in his *Last Times* says, "The judgment of

God is the administration of God" (p. 141). Again in his *Ten Virgins*, "And so the judgeship of Christ is not to be separated from the reign of Christ or his sovereign ministrations as King of kings and Lord of lords" (p. 162). He pronounces the old view—"of hearing and determining each one's individual case at some grand assize in which all men shall simultaneously appear before Christ to receive their dooms"—"a meagre and most inadequate view of the matter." But at the time of the publication of the first edition of his *Last Times* (the later is not at hand) he knew of no orthodox writer who regarded it as a mere process, for the authors quoted do not teach that it is a mere process but only that the judgment is held during the time of the millennium. But the premillenarian view differs in several essential particulars from the modern doctrine. The New Theology so far as it departs from the old orthodox doctrine cuts itself loose from the whole current of the Church's faith and allies itself with rationalists.

This perfect unanimity of faith on this subject in all ages and amid such diversity in other doctrines is itself a strong argument for its truth. If Christ taught a mere process, a crisis in individual character, a mere development in individual history, it is very strange that the disciples and all the ages since should have so thoroughly misunderstood him. If he promised only a coming in history but no personal, visible return in splendor and glory, it is very remarkable that all ages of the Church should have been so blinded by Jewish sensuousness as to continue to look for him.

This argument is so strong that a number of attempts have been made to explain the fact away. Some suppose that the disciples misunderstood the words of Christ. Weiffanbach attempts to reduce the prophecies of Christ concerning his return to a promise to reappear after his resurrection. Some think that Christ himself was mistaken. Others, despite the very wide difference between the Jewish hopes of Messiah and the Christian idea of the second advent, would explain it by mere Jewish crassness. J. Freeman Clarke proposes a solution in mere "rhetoric," but finding that not quite sufficient was forced to resort to the supposition that "Paul's views on this subject gradually

changed under the influence of a growing spiritual insight." (Orthodoxy, Truths and Errors, p. 348). Such are the difficulties men have found when trying to cut loose from the old doctrine of the last day.

The faith that has stood for ages will stand unless proven false. The *onus probandi* falls on the new. Those who have been schooled in the theology of the Scriptures must be convinced by proofs drawn from the Scriptures before they will give up the old doctrines. A thorough discussion of the Biblical statements would require an entire article but we may consider the main points.

The Scriptures teach that the final judgment is a definite event at the close of the world. "Inasmuch as he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness." (Acts 17 : 13). "Wherefore judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness and make manifest the counsels of the hearts, and then shall every man have praise of God." (1 Cor. 4 : 5). "The word that I spoke shall judge him at the last day." (John 12 : 48). "I say unto you that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for you." (Matt. 11 : 24). "So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the righteous and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." (Matt. 13 : 49, 50). "Before him shall be gathered all the nations." (Matt. 25 : 31). "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." (1 Thess. 5 : 2). Day here, as often in the Scriptures, means a period, but a period still to come; for in it "he will judge the world," embracing "the nations," of which nations Sodom will be one. It will be at the end of the world, and will come as a thief in the night. These passages and others cannot by any natural interpretation be applied to a mere process.

This general judgment will be immediately preceded by the general resurrection and the visible advent of Christ. This visible advent is a catastrophe and by modern thought is denied. A personal coming is conceded, but "it is spiritual to the soul." "Christ comes to us in the form of new truth which will correct

our errors and enlarge our hearts." This view confounds the two kinds of coming. Christ speaks of comings that were to take place during that age. "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." (Matt. 10 : 23). "There be some standing here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." (Matt. 16 : 28). "Repent or else I will come to thee quickly." (Rev. 2 : 16). "The Lord is at hand." (Phil. 4 : 5). These comings do not by any means exhaust the scriptural idea. If at one place he says "The kingdom of heaven does not come with observation," he does not exclude another stage of that kingdom which will come with grand displays of power. If he speaks repeatedly of coming to individuals and to ages, he does not thereby cut off the idea of an open, manifest return. "This Jesus which was received up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." There is no symbolism here; it is the plainest and most direct form of statement. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout with the voice of the arch angel and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." Though Clarke says that "Paul outgrew this literalism and in his later epistles speaks of sitting already with Christ in 'heavenly places'" (Orthodoxy, p. 327) yet it is worth while to see what that great apostle taught. "Christ the first fruits, then they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end." (1 Cor. 15 : 23, 24). In Acts we are told "the heavens must receive him until the times of restoration of all things" (Acts 3 : 20), and Paul tells us that "our conversation is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." (Phil. 3 : 20). John teaches the same truth. "Behold he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him and they which pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him, even so." (Rev. 1 : 7). In Hebrews we are told that he "shall appear apart from sin to them that wait for him." (Heb. 9 : 28). Whatever difficulty there may be in explaining Matt. 16 : 27, 28 and the parallels in Mark and Luke our Lord in his discourses teaches the same thing that Paul does in his earlier epistles. This is found in many of his

parables—as that of the nobleman, of the virgins, of the talents, of the unjust judge, and others. He spoke of raising the dead at the last day (John 6 : 40, 54). He tells us that “all the tribes of the earth shall mourn and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory” (Matt. 24 : 30), and that when he “shall come in his glory and all the angels with him then shall he sit on the throne of his glory” (Matt. 25 : 31), and that “as the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall the Son of man be in his day.” (Luke 17 : 24).

The modern theology attempts to destroy the force of the language of our Lord in three ways. First, it attempts to explain all his eschatological prophecies by that one saying, “The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you there be some that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.” This passage is acknowledged by all to have difficulties—for the new as well as the old doctrine. But we are asked to reverse the rule and explain the plainer teachings elsewhere by this the more difficult. The new applies it arbitrarily to the destruction of Jerusalem. It may and most probably has another meaning. Second, The new fails to see anything in the long discourses in Matthew but a prophecy of the taking of Jerusalem, ignoring the fact that our Lord was answering two questions—one concerning the ruin of the temple and the other the end of the world. It forgets also the nature of prophecy: combining in the same view two or more events, the one being a type of the other. The fall of Jerusalem is made a type of the end of the world, and thus in foretelling the one he prophesies of the other. With this key the last part of the discourse is seen to refer clearly to the final judgment. Third, It finds symbolism in these discourses and thus assigns all that is contrary to its theory to figure of speech. Dorner says, “For as Schleiermacher rightly saw, Christ’s second coming forms the real center of the entire Christian eschatology, and we shall recognize its dogmatic importance in reference to

the person, office and kingdom of Christ, however important it may be to take into account the figurative phraseology in the exposition of this fundamental thought." There is figurative language but "it is the garb of the glorious thought of God." The same principle applied to the other discourses of Christ would leave us very little that would be worth the saving. Van Oosterzee in reference to the symbolism in the teachings of the New Testament in regard to the last things says, "All the Apostolic exhortations and consolations are so closely connected with the prospect of a personal return of the Lord that whoever contradicts this last thereby takes away the roof and cornice from the structure of the Apostolic theology."

The two theologies are agreed that Christ is judge. The testimony of the Scriptures is unmistakable. "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ" (2 Cor. 5 : 10). "This is he which is ordained of God to be the Judge of the quick and dead." (Acts 10 : 42). "For neither doth the Father judge any man but he hath given all judgment unto the Son." (John 5 : 22). "He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." (Acts 17 : 31).

But they disagree as to the reasons of the judgeship and the manner in which he discharges its function. The new finds the reasons in his relation of the truth. He is regarded as so connected with the truth as to determine in connexion with it personal character. He judges every man because every man either in this life or the next must form and fix forever his character under the motive of the personal work of Christ. But the old theology finds that reason in the relation in which he stands to the world as ruler. He must reign until every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess—until all things are brought into subjection. The general review of his work and the exhibition of its perfect righteousness is the last act of his administration.

Even if it were true that all men are to be offered salvation, the reason assigned by the new would not be sufficient to account for the appointment. He is to judge angels who have not been redeemed. "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." "Of judgment because the prince of this world hath been judged." (John 12 : 31 ; 16 : 11). "For if God spared

not angels when they sinned but cast them down to hell to be reserved unto judgment." (2 Pet. 2 : 4). "And the angels which kept not their own principality but left their proper habitation he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6). "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone." (Rev. 20 : 10). Not only this judgment of the fallen angels remains unexplained by the new theology but also the work which Christ does in the final judgment. He is said to come, not to fix character, but to reward it. We stand before his judgment seat "that every one may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. 5 : 10). "Who will render to every man according to his works." (Rom. 2 : 6). In the description given in Matthew 25 he pronounces judgment upon character formed at other times and places.

The final judgment is not to reveal character to the individual himself but to manifest it to the world. He will judge the dead as well as the quick (Acts 10 : 42 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 1 ; 1 Pet. 4 : 5). He will judge the dead for deeds done in the body. The character formed by these deeds had long before not only been determined but revealed to each individual. What rational purpose in calling them up again to show them what they already know? It must, then, be to show that character to others.

The New Theology must explain away a large class of passages, or leave two classes unreconciled, which present no difficulty to the old doctrine. The Bible on the one hand makes personal faith the condition of salvation. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on him." "For by grace have ye been saved through faith." "Being justified by faith we have peace with God." "Whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life." Even if we rule out the language in Mark the doctrine is that of Paul and all the apostles: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved but he that believeth not shall be condemned." But the Bible teaches on the other hand just as clearly that we shall be judged in the last day by our works.

Further, the Bible teaches on the one hand that many at least

enter at death upon their eternal reward. "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." "To be absent from the body and to be at home with the Lord." "If the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved we have a building from God, a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens." "And it came to pass that the beggar died and that he was carried away by angels to Abraham's bosom; and the rich man also died and was buried. And in Hades he lifted up his eyes being in torments." But the Bible teaches on the other hand that in the final day all nations shall be gathered before the judgment to receive rewards.

Shall we be judged at one time according to our faith and at another by our works with precisely the same end in view? Shall God decide our fate at death and then call us again to review our character to assure himself that he made no mistake? The New Theology may find a reconciliation by changing the doctrines of the atonement and justification by faith and by putting forced interpretations upon the texts concerning the judgment, but according to the old doctrines these statements are not only in natural and complete harmony with themselves but also with all the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. For naturalness and consistency the old may challenge comparison. There is no conflict in these seemingly opposite declarations of the Scriptures if God, as the old theology taught, decides our condition at first in view of our faith and then at the last reviews our lives to show the correctness of his decision. We are saved through our faith. Faith reveals itself through works. God reads hearts and knows what is in man. Creatures can know the hearts of others only as seen in character. When God decides for himself he looks immediately at the faith. When he would show others that this individual has been justly saved and that one justly condemned because of the relation of each to the terms of salvation, he must point to the evidences of faith or disbelief in the conduct. If God created the world to reveal his own character to himself there might be no need of a general judgment, but he created and administers the affairs of the world to reveal himself to intelligent creatures. If God were only a Father there would perhaps be no need of a general review, but he is King as well as Father. He maintains his au-

thority by enforcing his laws. He wants loyal subjects and he seeks, therefore, to show them that he is no respecter of persons but is just and equal in his administration. To secure this end, just before the final consummation he reviews his government in its details and puts forever beyond question the fact that it was established in righteousness.

ARTICLE V.

THE REQUISITES OF A GOOD LUTHERAN CATECHISM.

By REV. H. ZIEGLER, D. D., Des Moines, Iowa.

This is a subject of the highest importance in our Church, and yet, to my knowledge, it has never received a careful and thorough discussion. The following article proposes to undertake this task.

The *first* requisite is—*Such a work must make the text of Luther's Catechism the basis of its outline and entire development.*

Without this, it would be no Lutheran catechism. Besides, nothing better, in subject-matter, can be produced to attain the great ends of catechetical instruction—conviction of sin, repentance towards God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and subsequent growth in the divine life.

The *second* requisite is—*The catechism as a whole must possess comprehensiveness, brevity and simplicity.*

It must be sufficiently comprehensive, in its outline, to embrace everything that is vitally essential to the production and growth of a healthy and earnest Christian life and experience; in its details, it must be sufficiently brief to allow of development by the catechist, and to be easily memorized and retained, and, in its language, also sufficiently simple, to be readily understood by the catechumen.

The *third* requisite is—*The English text of the catechism must be free from faulty translations.*

In Luther's explanation of the second article of the Apostles' Creed, we have introduced and perpetuated a faulty translation in our General Synod's English Catechism. It is in these words :

"Who hath redeemed, purchased and delivered me." This is taken from the German text, and reads: "Der mich verlornen, verdamnten Menschen erlöset hat, erworben und gewonnen von allen Sünden. (Who hath redeemed me a lost, condemned person, purchased and delivered me from sin, etc.)

Our catechism makes the three terms—redeemed, purchased and delivered—coördinate, together expressing the work of Christ for us. The erroneousness of such a rendering is seen, *first*, in the impossibility of making each of these three terms express a distinct part of our redemption. It is seen *secondly*, in the collocation of the words in the German of Luther's Catechism: "Der * * erlöset hat, erworben und gewon." Were the three terms intended to be coördinate, they should stand: Erlöset, erworben, und gewonnen hat; but as the auxiliary, "hat," stands after the first of these terms, it must be generic, and the two which follow are specific or explanatory. This is still more evident when we consult the Larger Catechism, in which Luther makes his meaning very clear. "To become our Lord," he says, signifies, "that he hath redeemed me from sin," etc. Further on, he explains this to include: "Who hath torn us from the jaws of hell, regained us, made us free, and brought us again into the protection and grace of the Father, and has taken us, as his own property, under his own protection and care, that he might govern us," etc. He used the German terms—"aus der Höllen Rachen gerissen, gewonnen, frei gemacht, und wiederbracht in des Fater's Huld und Gnade." Again, in summing up the meaning of this second article of the Creed, and after once more stating what our Redeemer has done, namely, "brought us from satan to God, from death to life, from sin to righteousness, and preserving us in the same," he proceeds to tell us, that the different parts of this article as they follow each other, are only intended to explain and express this redemption, how and by what means it was accomplished, namely, what it became him to do, and what he actually did and ventured ("gemacht hat,") that he might regain us (gewonna), and bring us under his dominion.*

*Müller's Symb. Books, vol. I., pp. 453, 454. Ed. 1848.

All these terms—tearing us out of the jaws of hell, regaining us, freeing us, bringing us into the protection of the Father and under his own dominion—are Luther's own explanation of the term, *redeem*; and this explanation he gives us in his Smaller Catechism, in the terms, *erworben und gewonnen* (purchased and delivered); and also in the closing words: "In order that I might be his, live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and happiness."

The two Latin terms, "*redemit et liberavit*," are coördinates, the former expressing the atoning work of Christ, and the latter the end accomplished by it; and they are not, as in the German, preceded by a generic term including the sense of both of them. The correct translation, then, is—"Who hath redeemed me a lost, condemned person, purchased and delivered me."

This correction of making redeemed, generic, and purchased and delivered, specific or explanatory, is recognized in the following English translations of the catechism by the Synod of Pennsylvania, Dr. Conrad and Dr. Pantoppidan. But those of the Pennsylvania Synod and Dr. Conrad both afterwards seem to make these same terms coördinate. In that of the Synod of Pennsylvania, the 218th question reads: "Are you still such a *lost and condemned creature*?"

"No! For my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, has redeemed and delivered me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil."

Whilst Luther's arrangement of these terms are given in the translation of the article from which they are taken, and also in the 216th question, here we have them placed together and made coördinate; and then in questions 219, 220 and 221, we have the terms, "purchased," and "delivered," covering the entire ground of the three terms in question 218. I must confess to confusion in the use of these terms.

In that of Dr. Conrad, the 214th question reads: "What has Christ done for us by his sufferings and death?" "He has redeemed and delivered us from all sin, from death, and from the power of the devil."

Here the Dr. seems to have no use for the term, "secured," as given in the translation of the article in the front part of his

catechism. Besides, we must take the two terms, "redeemed and delivered," which he retains in his 214th question, as coördinate. Then in the 215th question, namely: "What is meant by Christ's redeeming us from sin?" Ans.: "That he, by his sufferings, made an atonement for our sins and delivered us from their guilt and power"—in this question he makes the term, "redeem," cover the ground of purchase and deliver. Again, in question 216th, he has no use for either of the terms, redeem, secure, or deliver, for in the question he uses "preserved," and in the answer "ransomed," namely: "How has he preserved us from death?" Ans.: "He has ransomed us from the fear of natural and the pains of eternal death, and will raise us up at the last day." If we are to understand the terms, "redeemed and delivered," in question 214th, as coördinate, then questions 215, 216 and 217, should read: 215. What is meant by Christ's redeeming and delivering us from sin? 216. How has he redeemed and delivered us from death? 217. What is meant by Christ's redeeming and delivering us from the power of the devil? If, on the contrary, "redeem" is used generically, and "delivered," specifically or explanatory, then the term "redeem" should alone appear in the three questions above. Again, I must confess to the same confusion to the Dr's use of these terms, as in the previous case.

Allow me to suggest that all this confusion arises from not considering "redeem as generic, and "purchased and delivered," explanatory. Thus understood and treated, no confusion can possibly arise.

Dr. Pontoppidan strictly follows this plan. In putting his questions (from 212 to 227), he uses no other term but the generic, "redeem."

In the third article of the Creed, the General Synod's Catechism has another faulty translation, in the words "*not merely*."

This implies that our reason and other natural powers can do something towards believing in, and coming to, Jesus Christ our Lord. This is a grave doctrinal error, and contrary to all Lutheran theology. That it ever crept into our English translation, and that it has been so long retained, does no honor either to

our learning or our sound doctrine. We will carefully examine the original. The German reads: "Ich glaube, dasz Ich nicht aus eigener Vernunft noch Kraft an Jesum Christum, meinen Herrn, glauben oder zu ihm kommen kann;" * * The Latin is, if possible, still stronger, "Credo me propriis rationis meae viribus Jesu Christo, Domino meo, fidere, aut ad eum accedere et pervenire nullo modo posse;" * * The German, as thus seen, simply denies any ability to our human reason and other natural powers, in believing in, and coming to, Christ, without the divine call, etc., whilst the Latin declares that this is *by no means* possible to the strength of our own reason.

In the Larger Catechism, Luther says: "For neither you nor I could ever know anything of Christ, neither could we believe in him nor find the way to him, were it not offered to us and placed as a gift in our bosom by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel." Again, "For although the whole world has been earnestly searching to know what God is, and what he purposes and actually does, yet has it never been able to attain to a knowledge of any one of these truths."*

Again, in the same article, our catechism makes the "Communion of Saints," a separate article from "The Holy Catholic Church," by the punctuation both in the English and German texts.

In his Larger Catechism, Luther explains it thus: "The Creed calls the Holy Christian Church *communio sanctorum*, a communion of saints, for both parts are placed together to express the same thing. But formerly the one part was wanting, and it is badly and without sense (*unverständlich*) rendered in German by communion of saints." Again, "Also this word *communio*, which has been added, should not be rendered communion, but congregation." And once more, "But to use pure German, it should be called, a congregation of saints, that is, a congregation in which there are purely holy persons, or still plainer, a holy congregation."†

Dr. Morris' catechism retains both these faulty translations. (See p. 72, question 3, and pp. 78 and 79, questions 1 to 6).

*Müller's Symb. Books, vol. I., pp. 455 and 460. Ed. 1848.

†Müller as above, p. 456 and 457.

Dr. Conrad's translation corrects the first of these mistakes, ("not merely") but retains the latter ("the communion of saints") in his explanations, (pp. 11 and 70 and 71).

Whilst nothing unscriptural is taught in these catechisms in the explanation of this article of the communion of saints, there is certainly no good reason why we should depart from the sense in which Luther and our Church generally has employed it. The communion of saints with God and with one another, can still be taught in connection with the one universal Church.

Also in Luther's explanation of the introduction of the Lord's Prayer, our General Synod's catechism is lame: First, in the words, "Even as *beloved* children entreat a *kind and affectionate* parent."

These words—"beloved," and "kind and affectionate," locate all the affection and disposition expressed by them, exclusively in the parent—none whatever in the child. It is a child "beloved" by the Father, and it is a "kind and affectionate" father towards his child. Now, whilst this is all true of God as our Father, it is not found in Luther's catechism. In the Latin we have no qualifying terms—it is simply, "*liberos*," and "*parentibus suis*." The German has it—"die lieben Kinder," and "ihren lieben Vater."

Now, whatever sense we may give to "lieben," it describes equally the affection of the child towards the parent, as it does that of the parent towards his child. A correct literal rendering, therefore, would be: Even as dear children entreat a dear father—that is, as the parent's most tender affections go out towards, and center and linger around, his child, so in like manner do the same affections on the part of the child, manifest themselves towards its parent—the feelings and attachments are mutual. On the part of God, it is expressed thus: "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." "But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck and kissed him." * * "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son." * * On the part of the child it is: "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee; * * but God is * * my portion forever." "As

the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God; when shall I come and appear before God?"

These terms, "beloved" and "affectionate," ascribing all the affection to the Father and none to the child, are found, as far as I have examined, in all our English catechisms.

Our General Synod's catechism is faulty, again, in rendering Luther's explanation of this introduction, in the term employed to connect the last clause—"to call upon him with all cheerfulness," etc.,—with the first clause—"That God would affectionately invite us," etc. This connecting word is "*and*;" and the sense of our rendering is, "That God would hereby affectionately invite us," *first*, "to believe, and to be assured," * * and *secondly*, "to call upon him with all cheerfulness." * *

Luther's connecting term is, "*auf dasz*," in order that. According to this, "God would affectionately invite us to believe that he is truly our Father, and that we are his children indeed, *in order that* we may call upon him with all cheerfulness," etc. It makes our calling upon God as dear children call upon a dear father, dependent upon the antecedent attainment and the present possession, of an assured belief that God is our right Father, and we his right children.

This involves an important doctrinal statement—nothing less than that God by his prevenient grace works faith in us through the gospel call, and thus, by the light, comfort, and renewal which this faith brings us, enables us to call him "Abba Father."

I have never seen this distinctly brought out in any of our catechisms. Dr. Conrad's answer to his 279th question, "What is meant by this?" (the introduction of the Lord's Prayer). Ans. "It means that we are the children of God, and that we may cheerfully present our prayers to him as to an affectionate father, with all confidence that he will hear them"—is all true in itself, but it fails to bring out what Luther intended. And yet, how important is it that our catechumens should clearly understand this before proceeding to the petitions themselves—it is the importance of having the right faith in God as our heavenly Father, in order that we may draw near to him in prayer, in the

only right way—in cheerful, filial confidence that he will hear us.

It may be admitted before proceeding, that the order of connexion between God's inviting us "to believe that he is truly * * and "to call upon him with all, * *," may be so handled as to maintain that this very connexion teaches that our faith is the preparation for our calling upon God, as just indicated; but grammatically, it is not in the translation.

To bring out the spirit and beauty of Luther's explanation of this introduction, in its full force and comprehensiveness, I would suggest something like the following series of questions:

1. What relation between us and God, does this explanation of Luther refer to?
2. Do we heartily believe this, by nature?
3. How does God work this faith in us, according to Luther's explanation?
4. To what end does God work this faith in us? "In order that we may * * "
5. How are these several terms to be understood?
6. Can we not pray in this cheerful, childlike, and confiding spirit, without this faith?
7. Give me the reason why we cannot.
8. Have you this faith?

I would call attention also to the words, "truly our Father," and "his children indeed." The terms for "truly" and "indeed," are, in Latin, "verus," and in German, "recht." "Scheller's Lateinisch-Deutsches Hand-lexicon," and "Heyse's Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache," define these words, thus: *Verus*, by wahr, echt, by viewing a thing in its right light, as, a true father in opposition to a step-father, as a true faith, etc.; and *recht*, by verus, legitimus, echt, and by anything bearing the marks of its own kind or genus, as, a true friend, the true God, the true faith.

These two terms, *verus* and *recht*, are then used synonymously; and they view the relation between parent and child from two standpoints, the legal and moral. A true or right father or child is so, *legitimately* before the law, and *morally*, by possessing and exercising the affections and dispositions, and performing the

duties, of such a father or child. Thus, God is our true or right Father, *legitimately*, by creation and adoption, and *morally*, because he possesses and exercises towards us all the duties, of such a Father, in redeeming us, and in his providential dealings and gracious care exercised over us from day to day. Similarly, we are God's true and right children, *legitimately*, also by creation and adoption, and *morally*, because we also possess and exercise towards God the affections and dispositions, and perform the duties, implied in this relation.

I would, then, render Luther's explanation of this introduction, thus: "God desires hereby most affectionately to invite, draw, and influence* us to believe that he is our true and right Father, and we his true and right children, in order that we may call upon him with cheerfulness and in full confidence, as dear children entreat a dear father.

The *fourth* requisite is—*The doctrinal statements must be in harmony with the word of God and our recognized confessions.*

Under the previous test, I called attention to the synergistic error, that our reason and other natural powers have some ability to believe in, and come to, Jesus Christ our Lord. Also, to the doctrine of prevenient grace, in preparing us, by the invitations of the gospel and by the faith wrought thereby, to pray with cheerfulness and confidence to our Father in heaven.

Now, whilst the standards of our Church and her teaching have always been correct on these doctrines, it is, nevertheless, a matter of vital importance, that, in a book for the indoctrination of our youth, all doctrinal statements should be so precise and clear, that there could not possibly be left any doubt or confusion on the mind of any one. I need not insist on this—it is sufficient to mention it.

The *fifth* requisite is—*The catechism ought to set forth with great prominence and clearness our ruin and helplessness as sinners, the plan of salvation through the atonement of Jesus Christ, and our regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, through the means of grace.*

The defects here are, when the catechumen, after having

*I can find no one English word to express the German, "locken." [Why not "persuade"?—ED.]

passed through a course of instruction, has confused or erroneous views on any of the following points:

1. If he does not perceive that, on account of his personal sinfulness and helplessness, his only hope of salvation is in our Saviour Jesus Christ.

2. If he does not clearly understand the divine conditions of salvation.

3. When he is left in doubt on any one of the following points:

(a). Have I complied with the conditions of salvation?

(b). Have I been born again?

(c). Am I justified by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ?

(d). Am I converted?

(e). Am I a child and heir of God by adoption into his family?

Our sixth requisite is—*The subject-matter of the catechism ought to be arranged in a natural order, that is, in the order in which it must be personally appropriated to produce a healthy and vigorous Christian life and experience.*

We will now call attention to several plans for the attainment of this end.

First: To use Luther's catechism in the order of its five parts, without any explanatory questions and answers, leaving it entirely with the catechist to propound his own questions, and bring out fully and pointedly the order already indicated.

Second: To use Luther's catechism, as in the first plan, without any accompanying explanations, and then afterwards, by supplements, to explain fully the doctrines and duties which it inculcates, in systematic connexion, especially with the view of making clear and prominent the plan of salvation.

Third: Also to follow the order of Luther's Catechism, but accompanied with explanatory questions and answers, and bringing out, in connexion with these explanations the natural order we are seeking.

Fourth: Again to use the five parts of Luther's catechism, but to rearrange and combine their subject-matter so as to give us our natural order.

We will examine these several plans as to their respective merits.

THE FIRST PLAN.

Adopting this plan, the catechist ought to follow, accurately, the order of Luther's catechism, giving, *first*, his main questions and answers; *secondly*, his questions and answers explanatory of each main question; and then should follow, *thirdly*, a sufficient number of additional questions to embrace every distinct idea contained in Luther's explanatory answers, and following, as far as possible, their order of arrangement. This was evidently Luther's plan. (See the introduction to his Smaller Catechism, 2nd and 3rd divs.)

The advantages of this plan are:

1. That we preserve the text of Luther's catechism intact.
2. That we have in Luther's answers a skeleton of the entire development based upon them.
3. That this skeleton would be a great advantage to the catechist, enabling him to make it the basis of his examinations of his catéchumens on the questions based upon it; and also, to train them so that they can themselves expand a brief outline into a full development.
4. This would also enable the catechumen always to recall the substance of the explanations as given in the development of each topic, by merely remembering and developing the skeleton. He can, if he has been trained as above indicated, form for himself, from the terms of this skeleton, all the prominent questions based upon it by his instructor. This would, therefore, be a great aid both to memory and personal edification.

But this plan has also its disadvantages. (a) Whilst the order of Luther's arrangement is natural in its design and the means to attain it, it is unnatural in this, that the first part (the ten commandments) already implies a knowledge of God as necessary to our accepting, explaining, enforcing and obeying, his commandments. (b) Again, this plan leaves too much to the catechist in regard to the details of doctrine, and in making clear and prominent the plan of salvation. It necessarily presupposes that each pastor possesses not only a good faculty for analysis and generalization, but also, a clear insight into the prac-

tical relations of religious truth; both of which are necessary to success in using our first plan. This can not be expected—consequently, on this plan, many of our pastors would fail in attaining fully the great ends of catechetical instruction, either from a want of the necessary catechetical tact, or for time to make the requisite preparation.

These defects have been constantly recognized by our Church both in the old world and the new, by the many efforts that have been made to remedy them.

THE SECOND PLAN.

This plan was early adopted by the Lutheran Church in this country. The Synod of Pennsylvania, in its German edition of 1841, adds as a supplement to Luther's catechism, Parts II. III. IV. and V., including fourteen sub-heads. The first of these additions (Part II.) with its four sub-divisions, is devoted exclusively to the setting forth and explaining of the order of salvation.* Our General Synod also, in the various issues of its catechism, has uniformly supplemented Luther's five parts, with the last two sub-divisions just referred to, designating them Parts VI. and VII., and for the same purpose of explaining the plan of salvation.

This second plan has much to recommend it. It retains the advantages of the first plan, whilst it removes its defects, or, at least, makes such removal possible. How far our General Synod's catechism has succeeded in attaining its end by its supplementary Part VI., will be seen hereafter.

THE THIRD PLAN.

Namely, To follow the order of Luther's catechism, accompanying it with explanatory questions and answers, and bringing out, in connection with these explanations, the natural order we are seeking.

This plan has never been attempted by our General Synod; private ministers have not been wanting, however, to try their hand at it.

*See pp. 44-76.

As already stated, this plan must necessarily fail to give us a good natural order of salvation—indeed, it has always failed on this point whenever adopted.

THE FOURTH PLAN.

This plan as above stated, is to re-arrange and combine the five parts of Luther's catechism in the order in which divine truth must be personally appropriated so as to produce a healthy and vigorous Christian life and experience.

This re-arranged order would be as follows—

1. *The first article of the Creed*: Including the existence, nature and attributes of God, creation, preservation, government, and our duty towards God growing out of these doctrines, as shown in Luther's explanation of this article. Therefore,—

2. *The Ten Commandments*: To point out—our duty, our actual sinfulness, our natural depravity and our lost and condemned condition.* Therefore,—

3. *The second article of the Creed*: To show how our return to God has been rendered possible—or, The state of grace. Here we would have the origin of grace with God the Father, the purchase of grace by God the Son, embracing his names, states, natures and offices, his work of redemption—how? what? for whom?—the end of redemption—"to be Christ's, to live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and happiness"—The assurance that Christ will bestow upon believers these ends of redemption—Our inability without divine aid to come into this state of grace, and secure the blessings of our purchased salvation. Therefore,—

4. *The third article of the Creed*: To teach us how God affords us the requisite assistance to enable us to secure our salvation, or, *The application of grace*. Here we would have—Wherein our inability consists; How the divine aid is afforded and this inability is removed, namely, By the Holy Spirit operating through the gospel and the Church, as means, and through which he calls, enlightens, and sanctifies us, and gathers us into the holy Christian Church; The completeness of our salvation as purchased by Christ, and now brought within our reach by

*This includes, the state of sin.

the Holy Spirit. This last point would include—Forgiveness of sin, “daily and richly ;” adoption, sanctification, preservation in union with Christ—also, our resurrection, and everlasting life for soul and body.

5. *The reception of grace :* or, The conditions on which we can secure the salvation purchased by Christ, and offered unto us by the Holy Spirit—namely, repentance, faith, and the use of the means of grace, including The Lord’s Prayer, Baptism, and the Lord’s Supper.

I would add a brief recapitulation of the plan of salvation, for the express purpose of making deep and lasting impressions on the minds of the catechumens, and especially, of leading each one to accept and appropriate the truth savingly for himself. This recapitulation would be about the following :

A conscious sense of our ruined condition as sinners—an earnest longing to secure salvation—a clear conception of the way in which the work of Christ renders it just and possible for God to save sinners, namely, leading us to return to God by repentance and faith, justifying us by faith in Christ, enabling us to appropriate the fulness of Christ’s salvation, as implied in his threefold office of prophet, priest, and king, or “Christ made of God unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption,” and sanctifying and preserving us in the true faith, by the Holy Spirit and the use of the means of grace.

I would add again, an explanation and application of the main points of Christian experience, to which reference has already been made, so as to remove all remaining confusion and doubts on these vital doctrines. These points are—Have I been born again? Am I justified by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ? Am I converted? Am I walking after the Spirit in newness of life? Am I a child and heir of God by adoption into his family?

And I would add yet once more, Part VII. of our General Synod’s catechism, slightly modified, to be used—As a brief outline of Christian doctrines—For the examination and drill of the catechumens—And as an aid to memory.

Our *seventh* requisite is—*The catechism should be suggestive*, affording the catechist the opportunity, by questions of his own, for development, elucidation, and enforcement, and thus also, of

leading his catechumens to think and reason on religious truth and to apply it practically to their own condition and wants.

A main deficiency here is, when the catechism takes up every main idea suggested by an answer, and develops it anew not only by a new question but also by a new answer. Some one has said of a certain catechism, "It adds also to its worth, that, unlike some others, its explanations do not need explaining." If this is intended to mean that the language is so plain that it needs no explanation on the part of the teacher to enable the scholar to see the author's meaning, then we assent; but if it designs to say, that it is an excellence in a catechism to have its answers so full and clear that they will require neither elucidation nor development, then we decidedly protest. Such a catechism never has been written and never will be. Besides, if this were possible, it is not at all desirable. There must be room for the catechist to pursue the Socratic method of instruction, for the purposes already indicated.

The *eighth* requisite is—*The questions and answers must be couched in language which expresses fully and accurately the idea intended, and the dicta probantia must be a legitimate proof of the answer.*

Here the following defects may show themselves:

1. When the question suggests an answer different from the one intended and given. 2. When the answer is not legitimate to the question, namely, when it is not based exclusively on the terms of the question, or when some form in the question is used in a different sense from that in which it is used in the answer. 3. When the answer contains more or less than the question requires. 4. When the *dicta probantia* are not legitimate, namely, when they do not fairly prove the answer, or when they prove something different from it.

I will give a few examples. In questions 323, 325 and 326, of Dr. Pontoppidan's catechism (Eng. trans.) he puts the questions with *How?* but answers the questions, *In what sense?* In our General Synod's catechism, Part VI., question 72, reads: "Where did Christ remain after his resurrection?" But it answers an entirely different question, namely, Where did Christ go at the end of forty days after his resurrection? See also ques-

tion 324 and 325 in Dr. Conrad's catechism. The 324th—"What ordinances of a similar character did God institute in the Jewish dispensation? Ans. "Circumcision and the Passover." The 325th—"What is the difference between the ordinances of the Old, and the sacraments of the New Testament?" Ans. "The former were the mere 'figures' and 'shadows of good things to come,' while the latter are the seals and mediums of the blessings of the gospel themselves."

Take the ordinances of the old Testament as given in question 325, to refer merely to circumcision and the Passover, then these institutions were *mere figures and shadows* * * and neither seals nor mediums of gospel blessings. But understand these same ordinances as given in question 325, to mean what they do in the proof-text, Heb. 10 : 1, namely, the sacrifices of the Levitical ceremonial in general, then again, *all* the sacrificial types of Christ under the old dispensation, were *mere figures and shadows*, and neither seals nor mediums of any gospel blessing whatever—then they were not "our schoolmaster unto Christ." But God calls circumcision his covenant between himself and Abraham, and St. Paul designates it "the *sign* of circumcision," and "a seal of the righteousness of faith which Abraham had, yet being uncircumcised." St. Paul also declares that "the law" (ceremonial chiefly) "was our schoolmaster unto Christ." And in Leviticus, chap. 4, vs. 20, 26, 31 and 35, and in chap. 5, vs. 5, 10, 13, 16 and 18, it is repeated no less than eight times, after the priest had made the atonement: "and it shall be forgiven them," or, "it shall be forgiven him."

Whilst then, the ordinances of the Old Testament were "shadows," or types of "good things to come," and possibly not as clear in their meaning as those of the New Testament, they were nevertheless, equally with the latter, signs and seals and mediums of gospel blessings.

The *ninth* requisite is—*In addition to the printed proof-texts, others ought to be indicated by chapter and verse*, so that those who have the time and inclination may have the necessary references to enable them more carefully and thoroughly to study the word of God on the subject under consideration. And I would add, that occasional references to other books than the

Bible would be an important desideratum. Also, occasional suggestive and explanatory footnotes for the catechist, would be highly appreciated.

The *tenth* requisite, is—*The catechism should employ, as far as possible, the same terms throughout, to express the same truth.* This is highly necessary that the catechumen may obtain clear views of doctrine, free from all mental confusion.

Luther, in his introduction to his Smaller Catechism, insisted very strongly on the constant use of the same words, not only in the text of the five parts of the catechism, but also in the explanatory questions and answers, insisting that not a single syllable be changed, and for the same purpose as above stated.

Nothing renders an author so distasteful even to the educated reader, as a violation of this test, making it often necessary to compare page with page and expression with expression, in order to understand his use of certain terms, whilst nothing makes the perusal of others more pleasant and agreeable than the use of the same terms to express the same ideas. How much more, then, is this rule necessary in a catechism for the indoctrination of our youth. As an illustration, I will refer again to the indiscriminate use of the terms—redeem, secure, purchase, deliver, preserve—as noticed on a previous page. Another instance may be given. In Dr. Schmucker's catechism, we have the evidences of justification, to consist, first, of our inward experiences—"peace with God, a joyful sense of pardoned sin, the love of Christ shed abroad in the heart, and the consciousness of having been created a new creature in Christ Jesus;" and then, in the same answer, they are, to others as well as to one's self, "a new and holy life" * * or as given in the next answer, "our good works."* This is confusing. But more—neither of these is the primary evidence of our justification, for they can only show themselves as fruits of our personal knowledge of justification by a more radical and vital evidence. This evidence is, *first*, the fact that I have, as a lost, condemned sinner, cast myself upon Jesus Christ for salvation, taking him as my only and all-sufficient Saviour; and *secondly*, that having

*See questions 326, 327.

done so, God himself pronounces over me his own perfect absolution—"God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life"—"He that believeth on the Son of God, hath everlasting life." The other evidences, as fruits, are confirmatory of this; but when, as is often the case, we begin to doubt these, we must ever again fall back upon the primary and vital fact. This can never fail us.

The importance of making this distinction clear to our catechumens, can not be overestimated.

We will now apply these tests somewhat more fully, to a few of the catechisms that have been offered to our churches.*

Before doing this, we may say in general, however, that the catechisms thus to be tested, all have much to recommend them, whilst yet, no one of them comes up fully to our ideal of a good Lutheran catechism.

Dr. Schmucker's fails utterly on the first test—it gives us not the least recognition of Luther's Catechism, except by two brief sentences in the introduction. It does not make a single quotation from Luther, not even on the subject of human depravity, nor on the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. In short, it is no Lutheran catechism. As to the second test, it has the requisite comprehensiveness, but it lacks the brevity and simplicity which are necessary for catechumens. It is rather a short body of theology for theological students and adult church-members. The third test is not applicable in this case, as it does not give the text of Luther's catechism at all. As to the fourth, the doctrinal statements, whilst scriptural, do not, by any references or quotations, prove them to be in harmony with our Lutheran confessions. On the fifth and sixth tests, it is good, giving clearly the vital doctrines of salvation, and also a natural system adapted to our Christian experience.

In regard to the seventh test, it is too suggestive—it leaves *too much* to be explained to the catechumens. Under the eighth and ninth tests, we find its chief excellence as a cate-

*Those of Drs. Schmucker, Morris, and Conrad, and also that of our General Synod.

chism—it furnishes a sufficient number of appropriate proof-texts quoted in full.

On our first, second, and fourth tests, the other three catechisms are faithful, recognizing Luther's Catechism as their basis, being also sufficiently comprehensive, brief, and simple, and sound in their doctrinal statements. They meet also the seventh test of suggestiveness. Under the third requisite, I have already called attention to faulty translations, and also shown how they apply to these several catechisms.

In regard to the fifth test, our General Synod's catechism brings out very clearly and forcibly in its VI. Part, our ruin by sin and our deliverance through Christ and the Holy Spirit, and then, in a few brief additional questions, it gives us a rehearsal of the true and only way of salvation, (questions 108-119).

This is one amongst its chief recommendations—and I have not noticed this feature in any other catechism.

The catechisms of Drs. Morris and Conrad do not meet this requisite as fully as that of our General Synod, which any one will see by a careful comparison.

To show how the General Synod's catechism will endure our sixth test, of a natural order of salvation, I will give a brief generalization of the 16 questions of the VI. Part.

In questions 1 to 43, we have Man: his natural state, his origin—God: his existence, nature, physical attributes, works, moral attributes—Man: origin of his depravity, creation of our first parents, their constituent parts, his original state of innocence, his fall, its author—the devil and angels in general: especially the apostasy of devils, their essential nature after the fall, their employment, their aim in the seduction of mankind—Man again and his fall: the nature of Adam's fall and how manifested, his loss, his state after his fall, the hereditary consequences to all his posterity.

In this part, as will be noticed, things are considerably mixed—the natural order is interrupted.

The remaining part in questions 44 to 169, contains an excellent order of salvation, in the following topics—Sin, Salvation, Our Redeemer; The Atonement; The application of the pur-

chased salvation; Man and the Holy Spirit; Man and baptism as a means of grace; Man as fallen from his baptismal covenant by wilful sin, and the word of God as a means of grace; The special order of salvation by repentance and faith, also genuine repentance; The two classes of men; The believer fortified against backsliding, or relapsing into wilful sin; Man and the Lord's Supper as a means of grace; The believer's trials and conflicts; The four last things.

The catechisms of Drs. Morris and Conrad fail in this natural order, from their following the order of Luther's catechism throughout—a necessary consequence as previously shown.

On the eighth, ninth, and tenth tests, these three catechisms are, on the whole, satisfactory, in the correctness of their language and their proof-texts. In the General Synod's, however, the proofs are given only by reference, and occasionally they are not legitimate, neither are they always the best when they are legitimate. This is a great defect.

We will here call attention to a few more points in Dr. Conrad's catechism. Under the third commandment, it would be very desirable to have a father's duties enforced towards his children, servants, and even his cattle, and also the Nation's duties towards its servants, its aliens ("the strangers") and its subjects in general, in regard to the observance of the Sabbath. The 79th and 80th questions should be combined, for we can not "dishonor" our parents without at the same time "displeasing" them, and vice versa. Question 59: "How do you know there is a God?" Answer: "By the insight of reason, the testimony of his works, and the declarations of his word." Even if there does exist such an evidence for the proof of God's existence, as "the insight of reason," surely it is not the one that should be first presented to our youthful catechumens. To my mind there is no evidence of any value on this point either from the insight of reason, or from an innate knowledge of God, except possibly to students advanced in scientific and rational studies. The true and natural order of evidence is clearly this: The universal belief in the existence of a God amongst all nations, handed down from father to son, and orig-

inally given by God himself to our first parents in the garden of Eden, and afterwards continued to the patriarchs both before and after the Flood, and thus, (though obscured but not entirely obliterated)* handed down by tradition amongst all nations to the present day. This universal belief is then confirmed by the works of nature, by miracles, by the fulfillment of prophecy, and finally by the ennobling influences of Christianity on individuals and nations. All this is readily comprehensible to our youth.

Although Dr. Conrad inserts the text of Luther's catechism in full in the beginning of his book, he fails afterwards, in his development, to give us Luther's explanatory questions and answers, except in two instances—on the first and third commandments. This is to be regretted, for as a Lutheran catechism, it ought to recognize fully Luther's explanations—*first*, by giving in each case, his own explanatory answer on every main question; and *secondly*, by then developing Luther's own explanation, using his own language and order as far as consistent with a connected order of truth.

This has several very important advantages—*First*, as already shown under the first plan to attain a natural order of salvation. This would materially aid the catechumen in retaining the entire body of the catechism. *Secondly*, as far as comprehensiveness and brevity are concerned, nothing better can be done than to develop fully Luther's own explanations.

I would like to see brought out also, in connexion with Luther's explanations of the commandments, the essence of natural depravity and the necessity of regeneration as a necessary requisite to keep the commandments. By comparing these explanations with Art. II. of our Augustana, we will see how they imply both these doctrines as they are there inculcated. Such an explanation might be placed at the close of the ten commandments; and although there partly anticipated, it could be called up again at its proper place in connexion with the third article of the Creed.

In conclusion, we may be allowed to express our decided

*Rom. 1 : 18-32.

preference for the fourth plan as indicated under our sixth requisite, because, 1. It presents us at once with a systematic outline of doctrine and duty in perfect harmony with the plan of salvation; and it does this without any deviation from the integrity of Luther's catechism, simply by a few slight changes in the arrangement of its matter and parts. 2. It thus also avoids the two defects of the first plan—its want of harmony in its several parts with the orderly appropriation of religious truth for the development of a healthy and vigorous Christian life and experience; as also its inadaptability to the needs and circumstances of many pastors. Besides, it gets rid of supplementary additions for development and explanation, as required in the second plan. 3. In adopting the third plan—namely, following strictly the order of Luther's catechism in our development and explanations, and at the same time aiming at giving a natural and practical order of salvation—we constantly find ourselves in the awkward and unenviable position of trying to do what is impossible to be done. Our fourth plan steers clear of this awkwardness and consequent failure. And 4. It combines, in short, all the advantages of the other three plans, whilst it readily avoids all their chief defects.

And now, may we hope and pray that this exhibit will have weight in influencing our General Synod to inaugurate the necessary measures, at its approaching convention at Omaha, to furnish our district synods and churches with a first class Lutheran Catechism.

ARTICLE VI.

THE CHURCH AND THE LABOR PROBLEM.

By REV. CHARLES S. ALBERT, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

Every age brings its own problems. They are usually solved after a great many blunders have been committed, a number of provisional theories propounded, tried and found wanting. Slowly the truth evolves itself, becoming a little clearer through each successive attempt until at last a reasonable working theory is found.

It is apparent to thoughtful men that the relation of Labor and Capital is one of the greatest practical problems of our day. It is needless to review the history of modern industry which explains the dissatisfaction and unrest of the laborer. These are fully treated in the standard works on the Labor-problem. It would lengthen this article too much to discuss the changed conditions of trade and industry, brought on by the introduction of labor-saving machinery; by over-production, with its forced intervals of idleness and consequent want; by the growth of vast corporations, which are responsible to law and humanity only in a general sense; by the influx of cheap laborers, facilitated by our rapid modes of communication and transportation, the telegraph, the railroad, the steam ship; by the rise of demagogues who influence the laborer to his disadvantage and their profit; by the growth of labor-organizations, whose principles are vague and experimental and whose objects have never been tested by the stern realities of life, which labor-organizations are of immense power as the country has found within late years.

The purpose of this article is not the discussion of these matters so much as the discussion of the Church's present duty to the laborer and capitalist.

We put the laborer first. The Church has a message to all men. With it there should be no respect of persons. It knows no class. It deals with man. Every one is measured not by

his worldly standing, but by his relation to God. The Lord calls the rich man who was given up to harvests and increase of wealth, "Thou fool." He put Lazarus the beggar in Abraham's bosom, the rich man in hell. He does not do that because the one was poor, the other rich, but because the one feared God, the other lived for this world. With Zaccheus, the publican, the rich man, he abides, for he is penitent and believing and sits down at the feast of rich Matthew who has left all to follow Him.

We put the laborer first, because the Church is ever on the side of the weaker. The power up to this time has been with capital and not with labor. Here in our land it has not been quite as apparent as in the older countries. The conditions have been different and are to a certain extent different to-day. There have been no privileged classes. We have been fettered by no traditions. The laborer could and still can, though with more difficulty, become in a few short years a capitalist. But, capital is through its great syndicates and corporations beginning to dictate its own terms to labor.

Labor has sought to meet this by its labor-organizations, which give the power of united effort to oppose the power of wealth. One man alone has little chance in a conflict with capital. Numbers give power and gain a hearing. "Organized labor, so long as its purposes are legitimate and the methods by which their aims are to be promoted reasonable and just, must command a certain measure of public confidence and respect. Indeed it seems the natural outgrowth and almost logical result of that condition of things with which labor finds itself confronted, and it seeks, in organization and consolidation, protection against the oppressions of counter-consolidation in the shape of corporate power. Corporations are aggressive and dangerous, not only because they represent large accumulations of wealth, for those who own them, as a rule, are not those who manage them, but because they are directed by a very few persons, and the edict of a president or board of directors inaugurates a policy which directly affects, for good or bad, thousands of its employees. It is the absolute power vested in a few hands to direct the mighty machine under their control that makes it capable of all the oppression and wrong which some-

times marks its mismanagement. The stockholders and bondholders, who really own the property, are not, as a rule, those who mould its policy or shape its methods, although the form is annually gone through with of electing officers. Sometimes, it is true, these very officers are themselves the owners of controlling interests, but as a general thing they own but little of the corporate property."

These are sensible utterances. It seems, therefore, that one of the first duties of the Church should be to recognize the position of the laborer, because of its weakness, and that it should not denounce as some of our religious newspapers have done the effort of the laborer to protect himself by organization. We are well aware that there have been very serious blunders and wrongs committed by labor organized, as in the case of the strike ordered in New York by District Assembly No. 49. Here too labor must learn by sad experience its weakness and through failure be taught better principles and methods. It has allowed its organization to be controlled by a secret conclave and a few leaders and managers. There has been developed, more than in large corporations, the tyrannical power of the few over the many. A few demagogues order strikes which cause untold misery to thousands and tens of thousands. By the present management, the union man has sold himself body and soul to his organization. He has surrendered his liberty, his conscience. There is need of a changed policy, wiser management, or organized labor in its present condition will fail entirely.

Granted all this, the Church should distinguish between organized labor unjustly and unwisely managed, over against the right and necessity of organized labor. To refuse this would put the knife to its own throat, as the history of the Church shows its organization at times perverted and corrupt. It did not demonstrate that the Church had no right to exist, but it demonstrated the need of reformation of organization.

It becomes clergymen to study the labor-organizations, that they may form a just estimate of them. There are undoubted evils as indicated above, yet sober study reveals them as educational in their tendency, as uplifting in social life, inculcators of morality. Few organization have so deliberately set themselves

against profanity and intoxicating drinks as labor organizations. It is the Church that should ever be just and charitable. Unless it will be to the laborer, it will lose influence and power with this great and numerous class of our population.

This leads us to ask whether the labor organization tends to drift away from the Church?

We take the unfavorable signs first. Their deliberative district assemblies are often held on Sunday. Under the leadership of Henry George, in his recent canvass for the mayoralty of New York, for the first time in the history of our country, political gatherings assembled on Sunday.

There are within their ranks, many avowed opponents to both the Church and Christianity. I say both Church and Christianity for some draw a distinction and despise the Church whilst they hold to Christianity. The bitterness of the utterances of many is surprising and terrible.

Then again, large numbers of the working men never find their way into church. They live outside of its direct influence even if they are moulded by its indirect influence. Almost every pastor in large manufacturing centres is compelled as he enumerates his congregation to admit that the numerical proportion of laboring men in the church is not equal to the numerical proportion they bear to the whole community. He will have a larger proportion of merchants, clerks, business men, teachers, professional men, etc., either as members or attendants, than of laboring men. This is certainly serious.

On the other hand, we ought not to forget that every great movement will have in it all shades of opinion and belief. The tares and wheat ever grow together. It were supreme folly to condemn a movement because we could cite instances of ungodly men in it. That would condemn the Church, for she has always had in her visible ranks hypocrites, unfaithful and even skeptics. Many laboring men are true and devoted Christians. They claim that the demands which labor makes to-day are Christianity applied,—its principles brought into actual life. They affirm that the trouble is not with the labor-movement that so many are outside of the Church but with the Church itself. It has failed, they say, to sympathize with them, it has been de-

voted too much to those who have money to support it. The Church has become too aristocratic. People are not respected unless they dress well and pay largely. The poor are sent to mission-churches and are not wanted among the more cultured and wealthy.

"One reason," (writes one of Washington Gladden's correspondents) "for not attending the larger churches, which have wealthy congregations and good ministers, is that they are composed of the class who hire men to work for them, and, of course, dress themselves and their families better than the mere wage-worker can afford to do. When we see our employers going to church in broad cloth and silk, and satin, and furs, and laces and ribbons, it is natural for the man with the faded and patched coat and the woman with the calico dress, to feel rather uncomfortable in the midst of such finery."*

There can, I think, be no doubt that this is not a good spirit, though there is a certain justice in it. It is not Christian, for it savors of "the lust of the eyes and the pride of life," but it ought to show the ministry that they need to remind the strong to bear with the infirmities of the weak, to teach boldly plainer dress in God's house, Christian fellowship in the congregation and during the week and to declare and maintain that the standard of the Church is character and not money. We need more simplicity and a wiser and more sympathetic Christian love.

On the other hand, Gladden points out very forcibly in his work on Applied Christianity, that there are weightier reasons than this.

"It is evident that the wage-workers, as a class, are discontented. They feel they are not getting their fair share of the gains of advancing civilization.

It is evident that they are becoming more widely separated from their employers in the social scale.

It is evident that the old relations of friendliness between the two classes are giving place to alienation and enmity.

It is evident that the working classes have the impression

*Applied Christianity, Gladden, p. 156.

that the churches are mainly under the control of the capitalists and of those in sympathy with them."

With feelings of this character, we can well understand how very difficult it will be to induce the laboring man to enter the churches. He founds his objection really on justice. He does not receive that which he is entitled to in the matter of wages. Too large a share of the profits go to the wealthy, too little to the laborer. He remains poor, the rich become richer. How can he worship with men who do not give him justice? He does not care for friendship so much as he cares for justice.

He may be wrong, but these are his beliefs. We as ministers cannot well secure their attendance upon our churches until we either remove real evils, at least range ourselves against them, or, by a larger declaration of the truth, convince the laboring man he is wrong.

We must be willing therefore to study this whole movement, and as a Church seek to bring the principles of Christianity to bear upon the capitalist and the laborer.

First of all, the Church should insist and teach that there is a higher law than the law of supply and demand. Adam Smith in his celebrated work, *On the Wealth of Nations, its Nature and its Causes* (1776) laid down as the law of trade, simply, the law of supply and demand. We are to exclude moral requirement and act on a purely selfish basis. We are to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest market. The higher humanity is not to enter into our treatment of employees. All is to be based on selfishness. Free competition is demanded. The state must not interfere. The sole duty of the state is to remove restrictions which fetter individual liberty and make free movement and life impossible. "For Adam Smith regards it as a law of nature, that every one knows best how to manage his own affairs, and that the economical activity of the individual, though put in motion by the spring of self-interest, by care for his own advantage, must nevertheless lead to what is most beneficial to the common prosperity; that each, while laboring for himself, is at the same time laboring for the whole." Whilst there is truth in these propositions they must be modified.

Carried to its legitimate conclusion, it means the strong will oppress the weak. It brings evils, employment of children, no regard for the health of employees, wages reduced to the lowest, according to Ricardo's iron law.

How terrible were the words of Sir William Pitt, when the English manufacturers complained that they were not able to compete with foreigners, "Take the children." Since then so many children have been sacrificed to the modern Moloch, trade, that governments have been forced to interfere, despite Adam Smith's law, and protect the children. There is a higher law, the law of humanity as given by Christ Jesus. It is that which the Church needs to proclaim, to enforce it by argument and life.

The law of supply and demand is not a sufficient law in dealing with the labor of man. He is a moral agent. Of him more than machine labor is required, interest in his work, thoughtfulness for his employer, fidelity in the performance of labor. An engineer does not bring simply his labor to the driving of his locomotive. He brings a faithfulness, vigilance and courage which is far beyond the law of supply and demand. It is imperative that moral obligation be recognized by Christian employers and men be dealt with according to the law of supply and demand, modified by the law of Christian obligation, regard to the *man* who toils.

2. The Church should insist on the responsibility of wealth. Wealth is power. It is a Christian power when rightly used, in accord with the law of God. The administration of wealth brings so great responsibilities that it becomes a very difficult business, so difficult that an amount of thought, study and conscience enters into it which few undertake. Conscientious use of wealth needs the study of social science and the like topics.

The wisest charity is that which calls out a man's energy, self-respect and moral strength. It is accomplished not by money-gifts, soup-houses, charities, but by increased opportunities, better wages, improved homes, cheerful surroundings, care for operatives in the factories, regard for health, means of culture moral and intellectual.

The workman in general is careless and wasteful, his appetites

coarse and sensual, his amusements not elevating, or even restful, but have those, who might have helped him by wise counsel and judiciously directed his leisure hours, troubled or concerned themselves about him?

Immense fortunes which, out of their large incomes, give great sums to charities, if they have been amassed by the payment of low wages to the laborers, thus securing high profits to employers, do not accomplish the same good that a different policy might have secured, viz., the policy that sought to share its profits with the laborer by wise and judicious expenditure in his behalf and increased wages to him. This is the truer charity as it elevates our fellow-men and cultivates his self-respect and independence of character.

"Masters give unto your servants that which is just and equal."

3. The Church should insist upon the brotherhood of man with employers. There is need of personal interest in the men and their families, sympathy in their struggles and Christian love to them as brethren in Christ, in reality or possibility. "The strong should bear the infirmities of the weak." Our early industries were characterized by personal interest. Manufactories were small. Each employer knew personally his workmen, their families and their prosperities and also reverses. Then an employer who cared for his hands was secure. Sympathy and affection bound them together. Strikes were rare. It was hard to contend with the man who visited the families of his workmen in distress, who encouraged every laudable effort of progress and who recognized his workmen as brethren.

How changed to-day! Our great manufactories and corporations employ hundreds and thousands for whom they care less sometimes than the machines they use. The machine, if worn out, must be replaced with money, the workman if he contracts sickness in their employ can bear his own adversities and can be replaced by another without cost. The machine is, therefore, better cared for than the man.

There is little personal interest. The men are simply classed as workmen. Their outside life, their homes, their families all unknown. Is it remarkable that those who are thus selfishly bound together need so little to stir up strife and enmity?

There is need of more personal interest, the out-put of sympathy and love. The business man had better contract his operations and leave time for the cultivation of personal interest, sympathy and love, than to enlarge his fortune. In the one case he will be "rich toward God," the other "rich in the things of this life." Too often Lazarus lies at the door and the wealthy make no effort to bridge over the difference between them and treat him, "rich in faith," as a brother.

On the other hand the Church is the champion of no class. Her message is to all men. She needs to speak the truth to working men also.

1. The Church must protest against the principle that an organization is superior to conscience. No man has a right to obey man rather than God. When he belongs to an organization that orders him to do wrong, to disobey the dictates of his conscience, he has, after protest disregarded, but one resort, to leave the organization. There are, in the present Labor-unions, tyranny and demagoguery. The masses are under the control of an irresponsible few. Until these things are remedied there can be no true progress. Failure is bound to come. No movement based upon palpable wrong can succeed.

2. The Church must teach that there is diversity of gifts. All men cannot be alike, simply because it is in the very constitution of human society. There are the leaders and the led. Brain power and executive ability are gifts and cannot be manufactured to order. There are the hosts of industry, and there are captains of industry. Prof. Ely writes to laboring men, "Cast aside envy, one of your most treacherous foes. Reject every thought of leveling down. Cultivate an admiration for all genuine superiority. While all the monstrous inequalities of our day can by no means be upheld by good men, while many of these inequalities, the fruit of evil, can beget only evil, remember that nothing more disastrous to you could happen than to live in a society in which all should be equals. It is a grand thing for us that there are men with higher natures than ours, and with every advantage for the development of their faculties, that they may lead in the world's progress, and serve us as examples of what we should strive to become. It will not take

you long, if you think earnestly about this, to become convinced of this. It is well for the small farmer to have a rich neighbor to take the lead in the use of expensive machinery, the introduction of blooded stock, and in other experiments, which, if disastrous, would ruin a poor man."*

Captains of industry have, by their peculiar talents, accomplished much. Railroads have opened the land, increased wealth, facilitated transportation and enabled every laboring man to live better and cheaper.

There is a diversity of gifts and there will always be inequalities, but inequalities that tend to our advancement, well-being and happiness.

3. The Church should teach the laboring man that Christianity is the friend of labor. To the heathen, labor was a disgrace, to the Christian, an honor. The Lord himself had been a carpenter, neither a beggar, nor a rich man, but one with the great body of mankind. The apostles too were laborers. "The greatest sages of antiquity, Plato and Aristotle, declare labor degrading to a free man; the apostle exhorts that every one labor with quietness and eat his own bread, and lays down categorically the principle: He who does not work, shall not eat. From this simple proposition has grown a new world that has wrought greater things than Plato and Aristotle ever saw."†

Christianity puts upon labor moral dignity and honor. It says all labor is of God, all labor that is good, and that he who accepts his earthly calling as from God is just as much a servant, a child of God as any other. "The qualitative difference of work is done away with." "Simple manual labor is, in a moral point of view, as valuable as that of the loftiest kind and most comprehensive extent. Everything depends not on what a man does but, on how he does it, with what motive and what spirit."

Probably much of our present trouble arises out of the fact that the laborer does not honor his work. He claims that he is as good as any other man and, in his heart, is possessed with an unchristian spirit and pride, feels that his lot is degraded and

*The Labor Movement in America, Prof. R. T. Ely, p. 1.

†Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism. Uhlhorn. p. 188.

that he is not as good as the man that does not labor. He is in this a Pagan but not a Christian.

The true friend of labor is Christianity. It has an ennobling message. It elevates the laborer and his work, sympathizes with his struggles, and knows him as a child of God, to be honored for his character and not for his earthly position.

4. The Church must teach the working man that every scheme founded on any other basis than a Christian basis, brings misery, failure and, unless prevented, destruction. Many labor-agitators are avowed opponents of Christianity. They hate it because its methods are not revolutionary. It abides by the law of development and slowly, as men grow in knowledge and capability, destroys vices and advances men. They hate it because it inculcates submission. They do not believe in obedience to the state or the laws. They hate it because it holds forth that every suffering hath recompense in the world to come. They would have no future, no hereafter that men would, in desperation, right suffering by violence.

Many labor-agitators are avowed Materialists. The world is all to them. Its rewards, its enjoyments are all. There is no law of right but the law of pleasure. All we fail to get here is lost forever. Death ends everything.

Such terrible teachings must bring their legitimate results, ruin and anarchy.

All labor-agitators are not like these as we gladly and cheerfully admit. But the Church should not fail to show this danger, and unto those whom her voice can reach, utter her warnings.

She should disclose to them that there can be no common brotherhood without a common Father. Brotherhood can be entered into only by those who are bound by this great tie. Common interests, selfish considerations may bring men together for a time, but the organization that appeals to selfishness and not to divine law and righteousness ever falls apart. The leaders of the French Revolution soon divided and the stronger put to death the weaker.

Brotherhood must have, to be permanent and abiding, the

basis of common Fatherhood, the Fatherhood in God, in Christ Jesus.

The Church therefore has a great duty to perform. It will require on the part of her ministers thought, patience, courage, sympathy, love, but the end is worth all toil and sacrifice, the salvation of men, the salvation of our land, the increase and up-building of the kingdom of Christ.

ARTICLE VII.

LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM EXPLAINED AND AMPLIFIED
BY F. W. CONRAD, D. D.: A SYMPOSIAC.

In complying with the urgent solicitations of the Editors of the *QUARTERLY* to take part in this symposium, I confess to have been influenced largely by personal considerations. I am thus afforded an opportunity of setting myself right before those who may happen to know that I was appointed with Dr. Conrad by the General Synod, when it was proposed twenty years ago to have a catechism somewhat after the style of the one now under review prepared and published under its authority. The committee appointed for that purpose consisted of Drs. Conrad, Sheeleigh and myself. •

As is too often the case in committee work, so in this instance the labor was suffered to fall upon the chairman. It so happened, however, that he already, as he says, "had catechism on the brain," and with him it was strictly a labor of love. I soon begged to be excused by the General Synod from serving on the committee, and have no right, therefore, to claim any share in the praise now so liberally bestowed upon Dr. Conrad's Catechism. And I very much doubt whether any of the brethren who from time to time were appointed as co-operating committees, etc., during the tedious history of the General Synod's connection with the movement, viz. Rev. Drs. H. N. Pohlman, S. S. Schmucker, S. Sprecher, A. C. Wedekind, H. Ziegler, L. E. Albert, Joel Swartz and M. Valentine, had anything more to do with its preparation than I had.

At every General Synod from 1866 to 1881 the "*Committee on the Development of Luther's Catechism*" played a more or less

conspicuous part in its proceedings, until, at the meeting in Altona, in 1881, the whole matter was finally dismissed by the adoption of the following report:

"The committee on the Development of Luther's Catechism beg leave to report that, inasmuch as the plan adopted to provide an improved edition of Luther's Small Catechism, better adapted for general use, has proved impracticable, after a trial of many years, your committee respectfully asks to be discharged from further consideration of the subject.

F. W. CONRAD,
M. SHEELEIGH,
L. E. ALBERT."

And thus ended all connection of the General Synod with the aforesaid movement.

But this unpropitious action of the General Synod did not discourage Dr. Conrad, or prevent him from quietly completing his work, and he now presents to the Church the result of his patient and persevering efforts in this direction. He assumes the entire responsibility of the publication and is no doubt justly entitled to whatever credit it deserves.

And there are several features of his catechism that are highly commendable. In the first place, he has confined himself strictly to the explanation of *Luther's* catechism, *i. e.* to the original five parts, ignoring the various accretions that have been appended to it in multitudinous editions. Some of these, though added with the best intentions, have disfigured rather than improved it. And, in the next place, he has printed alongside of the original clauses, and also of his explanations of them, the appropriate scriptural proof passages.

It would be too much to expect that there should be no room for adverse criticism in the case of a publication of this kind in a Church like ours, where there is so great diversity of opinion and practice. The accuracy of some of his definitions and the relevancy of some of his scriptural quotations may well be called in question. But it is gratifying to observe that the Doctor has been careful to avoid giving any countenance to the altogether un-Lutheran expositions of Lutheranism that have characterized some of the so-called Lutheran catechisms heretofore published.

This manual will have to stand upon its own merits, as have those published upon individual responsibility heretofore, and it will probably contribute its share to THE ENGLISH LUTHERAN CATECHISM that will ultimately be recognized as the standard text-book for religious instruction *among all English-speaking Lutherans in our country.*

C. A. HAY, Gettysburg, Pa.

It is no injustice to others to say, that in the Lutheran Church of the General Synod there is not a man of wider range in thought, and of greater diversity in his activities than Rev. Dr. F. W. Conrad;—that there is no name in the Lutheran Church more widely known to Americans—Catholic and Protestant—than his.

Twenty-five years of ecclesiastical journalism have given him opportunities such as come to few men; his ability as preacher, lecturer and organizer, has always been equal to the demands incident to his position, while his name is imperishably connected with collegiate and theological education. And now, to the long list of his diversified labors is added the latest product of his learning and industry—namely, CATECHETICS.

In Aug. 1886, Dr. Conrad published, at his own expense and *on his own responsibility*, a little volume of 147 pp. entitled "Luther's Small Catechism, explained and amplified." In making our examination of this work we will begin with the title-page: and the first thing to observe is, that the purpose of the author as indicated in the title, is a guarantee, that his effort has been, not to *modify and adapt*, but to *interpret* Luther to the thought of the age by explanation and amplification. The next thing on this page to attract attention is that it is published, not for *examination*, but "*for use* in classes, schools and families." To this end it has been advertised and offered in any quantities to Pastors and Churches of the General Synod, whose Constitution, Art. IV., Sec. 2, says: "the General Synod shall be charged with the duty of providing the books to be used * * in the catechetical instruction of the young."

The catechism thus entitled and published has been examined

by Doctors, Professors and Pastors and in their judgments published in the *Observer*, uniformly declared to be the long-awaited *desideratum*, which, however, cannot mean, that the Church has hitherto had no explanation and amplification in English;—that would not be true, as Dr. Morris as long ago as 1844 gave the Church such a work, and in 1863 Drs. Mann and Krotel, under appointment of the Pennsylvania Ministerium performed a similar labor, as have also others of less note since then. It must mean that this has an excellence to which the others did not attain. This excellence, as adjudged by these examinations, seems to consist in these three things: 1. That it prints the proof passages; 2. That these are so appropriate and the words so fitting, that the exact application of the text to the point in hand comes at once under the eye and the mind makes the clear connection of the truth taught, and the authority by which it is supported; and 3. That it is not a European book of the 16th century. As to (1), this is not a new feature; as to (2), there may on examination and comparison, be difference of opinion,—as *e. g.* p. 27, Quest. 45, 1 Chron. 16 : 22 as *preceding* the answer to Quest. 47;—p. 101, Quest. 363, 1 Cor. 7 : 5 [an injunction about marital intercourse applied to the Holy Communion!—Ed.] p. 66, Quest. 220, The blood is precious because it *ransomed*. Is not the truth just the other way—namely, it ransomed because it was *precious*?—p. 67, Quest. 224, Is freedom from all pain, &c., the *result* of serving Christ *in heaven*?

And if (3) be true—then it is not "Luther's Small Catechism, explained and amplified," for unfortunately Luther's Catechism does come down to us from the 16th century; and it is certainly due from the man who would *interpret* him, not to misrepresent him.

In the preface the author tells us he has "for the convenience of parents" prefixed an *authorized* translation. This seems to be the translation of Dr. C. F. Schaffer, approved and published by the Penna. Synod in 1855, and "strictly adhered to" by Drs. Mann and Krotel.

In continuing this examination the writer would call attention to such points as in his judgment seem to call for revision, and restatement.

1. Should the answer to question 10 be accepted as a correct definition of the *significance* of baptism?

2. On pp. 21, 22, Is the logical form the best possible one? Note the answer to question 17 *defines* a law of God; 18 *affirms* that the *laws* of God are of several kinds and in 19, 20, 21 the *kinds* are respectively defined. Having done this, the author declares, then by a "universal affirmative," question 22, that "*the laws of God are binding upon all men*," which, however, proving too much necessitates resort to the "particular negative" in question 23 for which the mind is not prepared, the whole leading to inextricable confusion.

3. On p. 27 all of 47 and the latter clause of 48 express truth. But does it belong here?

4. Questions 237, 240, 242 and 384 lack precision. Of course our author is neither a Donatist nor a Puritan, who make the Church "throughout the whole world" to consist only of the regenerate. But, as the Church in the "whole world" is administered by men—for "we have this treasure in earthen vessels"—and as those who apply for her privileges must make their application to men: and if those only are entitled to her privileges who *are* in mystical union with Christ, and only those are to be confirmed who exercise *sincere* repentance, have *true* faith and do yield *hearty* obedience, who is to *discern* whether applicants possess these *required* qualifications? "I, the Lord search the heart."

5. Question 315 conditions the effects of the sacraments absolutely upon faith. Question 316 makes their *intrinsic* efficacy to depend, not upon the *faith* of the recipient, but upon their *inherent* constitution. There is manifestly a confusion of thought here: "intrinsic efficacy" possibly confused with the "validity" or the "integrity" of a sacrament. Schmid's Dog., pp. 549, 562, also 520, 521.

6. In reference to question 321, we would ask whether this is the Lutheran or Reformed conception of the Word and Sacraments as *means of grace*? Compare Augs. Conf., Art. V.; Chemnitz in Schmid's Dog., pp. 550, 551, also 517-524 with Hodge's Syst. Theol., Vol. 3, pp. 501, 502, 505, 507.

7. Question 328, If the element in baptism is not water,

what is it? Luther does not affirm that the *element* in baptism is not water—but, that *baptism*, i. e. the sacrament, is not *simply* water. The element is and remains water, even as the elements of bread and wine, which, “by Christ’s appointment become the medium of communicating the body and blood of Christ,” are and remain bread and wine.

8. Question 345. “It *may not be* absolutely necessary to *salvation*, but ordinarily necessary” (not to salvation) but “to *prove* the *genuineness* of our faith.” Should not the answer be definite—it *is* or is not—why and when, not. Note—that it (baptism) is ordinarily necessary “to *prove* the *genuineness* of our faith.” This is not in harmony with question 318—which states the *design* of the sacraments to be very different from the above. And, by the way, can baptism, in the nature of the case, be *proof* of the *genuineness* of faith?

9. Question 357. Is this presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Holy Supper, which is affirmed by reason of his Omnipresence—what the Lutheran Church means by “a sacramental presence?”

The additions which make the little volume a manual for Lutheran families, are a very commendable feature of the work.

JOHN A. EARNEST, Mifflinburg, Pa.

Several pastors, whose active ministerial experience dates back no less than fifteen years, were recently discussing catechisation, when one of them ventured the assertion that the ideal hand-book for religious instruction had not yet been published—at least not in an English translation; that some one eminently successful in training the youths of the church might have such a manual prepared, but from modesty or financial timidity resisted the temptation to offer it for publication.

The argument turned on the arrangement of a catechism to which the young mind would readily respond. It was maintained that the Introduction should embody, briefly, the essential historical facts of the Bible, and Religion in general—true and false. Then, since the child instinctively, if not logically, inquires first after the source of its being, *Theology* should be the starting point in a system of instruction for all learners.

Here would be the proper place for the I. Article of the Creed, followed by the Decalogue. Naturally, *Anthropology* would be the next step, because everything that concerns man—from his innocence and high estate through his fall and ruined state to his hopeless destiny—must be vividly impressed by the doctrine of God and his law. Now the inquirer is prepared for *Soteriology* where the need, plan, author and conditions of salvation can be very efficiently presented in the light of the II. Article of the Creed. Then logically would follow the doctrine of the *Holy Spirit*—the *Means of Grace*, the Church, the Word, Prayer, the Sacraments, all enforced by the III. Article of the Creed. *Eschatology* would appropriately conclude the course of instruction and fitly prepare the catechumen for the solemn rite of confirmation.

No originality is claimed for this idea except that of getting it into the QUARTERLY. Said pastors being at present unprepared to meet the fire of criticism their plan would rouse, unanimously welcome—as an advance in catechism-making—the work of Dr. Conrad.

It is manifest that the author in his explanations and amplifications allowed himself to be governed by three very important principles: 1. That conservatism which holds to the original five-fold order reasserted and preserved by Luther in his Smaller Catechism which has become the adopted system of doctrine in the Lutheran Church. Hence there is no uncertainty as to whether our children should be trained according to Lutheran custom, or after that demoralizing latitudinarianism for which any method is satisfactory only so it is undenominational and non-liturgical. 2. The importance of *memorizing* the main truths of salvation as against the growing looseness of some modern catechists, whose instructing consists of "talks" euphemistically called "lectures," and adds to the fatal pruriency of too many catechumens for entertaining novelty. To do effectual catechetical work, an authoritative not an elective system is necessary. When Peter admonished the *diasporoi* to be prepared—*Etimoi* (there is a difference between being ready and being prepared) to give answer, he had in mind no such answers as are so common among us, but an "apology" for the hope that

was within them. 3. The necessity of tact, conscientiousness and faithful oversight on the part of the instructor who is to present at every meeting of the class the ripest results of independent lesson-study; he is to fall back on his own resources in a devout and intelligent preparation that he may absolve himself from the humiliating charge made against the doctors of pre-reformation times. His sight of the class is to be an *insight*, in order that he may have the grand advantage over him who looks upon those he is training for the Master's service, but does not see them. There is no room in this new catechism for that mechanical, or official and priestly management of the young people which is largely responsible for the unconverted confirmants in our churches.

So true is this that a few prominent features of Dr. Conrad's method are worthy of special emphasis.

The key-note of the whole matter is struck in question 10 on page nineteen where baptism is accentuated as the act of admission into covenant relationship. How can that be an authorized book of instruction in the Church or a systematic, consistent Lutheran catechism, which ignores the very first element in Christian nurture? It would be an absurdity. Certainly the baptized children are the Lord's children. Whose else? Who would be so incomprehensibly obtuse as to want to nurture the devil's children? Yet Christian teachers are bold enough to dispute Cotton Mather's proposition: "The Lord has not set up the Church as merely that a few old Christians may keep one another warm while they live and then carry the Church with them when they die; but that they may nurse successively another generation * * to stand in His kingdom when they are gone." Nurse them! An elementary development is admitted. But from what starting point? How marked is the element of weakness in that man's system who pronounces baptism a mere formality! It certainly is not only unLutheran but unscriptural, not only contrary to historical Christianity but common sense to assume that the baptized children are no better than heathen. F. W. Robertson was not the only one to whom prayer was natural from the earliest dawn of intelligence. They

were adults to whom the Saviour said: "Unless ye be converted and become as little children."

From this stand-point it may be safely maintained that catechisation is a training *in* the Church not *for* the Church. This is forcibly suggested by Dr. Conrad's arrangement throughout. The age demands symmetrical character-building with the mortar well tempered. If the head of the family will accept his share and the learner will not despise the devotional portion, the teacher need not fear that his work will be disappointing. This is the only solid basis for true education. In proportion as the cry for non-denominational schools and colleges—which Dr. Hodge calls non-religious—becomes louder, the "watchmen of the nation" need to awake to their responsibility. Since the perpetuity of the state depends upon the *religiously* educated people, parents could do no better than turn to the indoctrinization of their children in essential, revealed truth. But the adage of the old nurse quoted by Sara Coleridge in one of her bright letters, has become an accepted sedative in our day: "O Lord, ma'am, it is not easy to kill a baby." It is hoped by many—and they solace themselves and pacify their consciences by this hope—that by some mysterious power the children will somehow survive the attacks of all spiritual foes until they are old enough to "go through the process!" It is one thing to argue about the necessity of conversion but quite another to obey the masterly old maxim: "Train up a child in the way he should go."

Hence the additional remark is here in place that the selection and arrangement of the "proof texts" recommend the needed catechism—not their number but their suitableness. "You read no Scripture," said the wide-awake hearer. "The length of my sermon would have prolonged the service," replied the self-complacent preacher. "But why did you not leave out some of your stuff and give us the word of God?" Homely comparisons may put a very eloquent disclaimer in an awkward position. Let not the most fluent catechist take it for granted that his expositions are preferable to the fastening of thought by divine teaching. One of the most accomplished teachers—Nissen—always fixed the "points" in his own mind in order that he might

verify the memoriter recitations of his scholars without the book. The entire Bible is before the teacher but he wants to imitate the true builder who does not insist on the quantity but the carefully chosen and closely fitting stones; the spiritual house is to go up by the material taken from the rich and inexhaustible quarry. Or, to give place to Bushnell here, "God's word is fit bread for children; they can make more room for gospel than we, and take in all precious thoughts of God more easily."

One thing however should be remembered by the catechism makers: the great mass of young people in the catechetical classes are not mentally disciplined; which does not imply that they are satisfied with the "mentally weak and the morally flimsy" and that in order to train them we must be childish. But it must be emphatically repeated that they can comprehend God in Christ far better than they can the technicalities and terminologies of learned expositors. The "deep things of God" may not be too deep for them but some of the questions and answers we have seen in catechisms are unfathomable abysses to them. Theology they can understand, but hair-splitting speculations are so many mysteries for them. They do not stagger at great truths and principles when they are luminously stated. The only simplicity they want is that of purity and clearness. He who makes the catechism for the Church is like unto him who writes the songs for the nation. After all there is no cheap way of making Christians of our children. Nothing but to practically live for it makes it sure. To be Christians ourselves. Ah, there is the difficulty!

J. C. KOLLER, Hanover, Pa.

Few men are good catechists. Fewer still, by large odds, are competent to write a good catechism. The sixteenth century produced but one; and not another, since then, has commended itself to general approval, though their name be "legion." The difficulty is inherent in the subject itself. *It is the reduction of the strong meat for men, to the milk for babes.* It is not hard to make clear things cloudy; but to make cloudy things clear and understood by children, requires not only great intellectual resources, but a very giant in literary humility.

Dr. Conrad's attempt in this direction, is indeed, praiseworthy, and taken all in all, is no mean success. It is *the* work of the Dr. that will outlive him longest and benefit the Church of his love most. Yet it must not surprise him to be candidly told that the "ne plus ultra" of Luther's catechism explained, is still a thing of the future. His effort is a great step in the right direction. Future editions may make it as nearly complete as human endeavors are likely to be. Friendly criticism may, possibly, contribute something towards this desirable end. In that spirit these lines are penned.

It must be remembered that this is not an original or new catechism. It purposes simply to "explain and amplify Luther's Small Catechism." If now I ask myself the question: what was Luther's design in preparing his catechism? The only correct answer is: to furnish *elementary religious* instruction to the ignorant of his day, whether old or young. Whatever other purposes this little book has been made to subserve since then, whether as a compend of theology, or as an integral part of the confessional writings of our Church—all which may be right, and proper—these things were not in the author's mind when he wrote the book. Accordingly he heads each of the five parts thus: "*As a house-father should teach his servants in the simplest way.*" The house-father is the designated teacher; the family, comprehensively, the servants, specifically, are the designated scholars. Whoever loses sight of this cardinal point, whether house-father or pastor, will miss every time attaining the object Luther had in view when he wrote this book. Now, as then, its *design is elementary religious instruction*. It is the first book of positive religious teaching placed in the hand of the child. It is his religious primer. Great plainness of speech and severe simplicity of style must characterize such a book. In this respect Luther's catechism is a model. And it is just here where Dr. Conrad's "explanations" are open to criticism. It is not difficult to account for this defect in the Dr.'s book. For nearly a quarter of a century he has been out of the pastoral office; and for the last 28 years he has wielded the editorial pen in discussing the profoundest problems

in Church and State. An elevated and ornate style has become natural to him. Besides all this, he is a born metaphysician. Almost every line that he has written bears traces of this his birth-right. Nevertheless, whilst all this may account for the defect, the defect is there and should be remedied.

Let an example or two illustrate my meaning. I open the book at random and my eye rests on the 23d question: "Why are not the ceremonial laws of the Jews binding on us?" "Because as types and shadows of a temporary dispensation, they were abrogated at the advent of Christ and passed away with the introduction of the gospel." Now this is a most excellent answer for theological students to handle, but how is it for a child 10, or 12, or 14 years old?

I let my eye run up to the next question above: "Why are the laws of God binding upon all men?" "Because they are based upon the nature of God and his relations to man, and were reaffirmed by Christ, and can therefore neither lose their binding authority nor be changed." Capital answer! Could not be better for theological students. But how is it for Sunday-school boys and girls?

I turn over a leaf or two, to question 54: "What is it to conjure by the name of God?" "It is * * to appeal to God to secure his direct interposition in the accomplishment of super-human ends." These examples taken at random, will illustrate my meaning.

Another remark: and this relates not so much to style as to the subject matter itself. Any "explanations" of Luther's catechism should have the questions and answers so arranged as to be the natural outgrowth of the text; having, like the branches of the tree, a living, unmistakable connection with the trunk. This will not only exclude all irrelevant matter, but will hold the mind of the learner in the focal light of the original text, until it is all aglow with the precious truth therein set forth. In this way the whole process of instruction will be like a chain, link fastened to link, idea blending with idea; aiding greatly the memory of the child and making catechisation a delight, instead of a dreaded task and burden, as at present. To walk or to rest in the refreshing shades of such banyan-tree-like groves of

truth, is a "consummation devoutly to be wished" for catechist and catechumen. "Hasten, Lord, the glorious time!"

Dr. Conrad has made marked advances in this direction. Still there is room for improvement.

These sentences are by no means to be construed as objecting to any independent discussion of any part of the catechism. In this direction Dr. Conrad has added greatly to the value of his catechism. His "Introduction" to the law, and his "Nature and Uses" of the law at the end, are like the head-light on the locomotive and the red light on the rear platform: the one pointing out how full of light is the way of obedience; and the other warning all who, recklessly or thoughtlessly, will run into the danger of wilful disobedience. So with reference to the other four parts, his prefixed or suffixed discussions are invaluable. That preceding the Lord's Prayer could only come from a heart that had the fullest assurances of the power, the privilege and the value of prayer, springing from a *life-experience* of prayer. His discussion of the sacraments is timely, temperate, truthful. The Church will not go wrong by believing and practicing what this catechism in all its parts sets forth.

Believing as I do, that the next edition will undergo a thorough revision, adapting questions and answers to the capacity of children and thus of all, whether young or old; removing some redundancies, and making the questions and answers generally pendent on Luther's text, I have no hesitancy in predicting that the next General Synod will hail with delight the opportunity of placing its *imprimatur* upon it and thus recommend it to the Church as the best book of the kind now in the English language.

A. C. WEDEKIND, New York.

The subject of *catechisation* has come to the front, and for some years has impressed itself upon the thought and conscience of our ministers. At synods and conferences, when methods of work are discussed, common questions are, "What catechism do you use?" "How do you conduct your catechetical classes?" Any one who is able to shed light on this subject is sure of an

earnest and appreciative audience. The great interest taken in Dr. Conrad's catechism shows how deeply this want is felt.

The greatest want however is not a good *catechism*, but good *catechists*. And a good catechism may be the means of raising up poor catechists. If the book before us be used as a *staff*, it will do good. If used as a *carriage*, it will hinder rather than help the cause of catechisation. A successful teacher has said, "a drop of life is worth more than an ocean of knowledge." Believing that no book, however good, can take the place of the living teacher, we estimate the value of a catechism by what it suggests rather than by what it contains.

The best catechism is one which each minister makes for himself. Given Luther's Catechism, the Bible History, the proof texts and the hymn book, the minister must give his class his own explanation and amplification if he wishes to attain the highest success in this important art. And yet such amplifications as the one before us have been used for three centuries with varying success and popularity, and within certain limits may be useful.

It would be easy to take up the book in detail and show from a thousand illustrations how in the critic's opinion the matter and manner of the catechism might be improved. But this would not be doing justice to the author or to the readers of the REVIEW. This catechism has merit. But we want to avoid the error of supposing that it is the *summum bonum* of catechetics and to ascertain the sphere of its usefulness.

In the first place, the catechism is not intended for little children, and therefore it is not necessary to criticise it from this standpoint. The language and forms of statement are not adapted to their comprehension. If the same catechism is to be used in schools, families and catechetical classes by children of all ages and different degrees of intelligence it might be well to indicate by two or three different kinds of type the questions which the different classes of children ought to learn.

It is evident that the author had in view the average intelligence of the members of catechetical classes, such as are preparing for admission to Church by the rite of confirmation.

Hence the theological terms and modes of expression which would otherwise be inadmissible are not entirely out of place.

Nor, in the second place, is it intended that the answers to the 391 questions of this catechism are to be committed to memory. It would not only be imposing a useless burden on the learners, but it would also be a pedagogical fault.

The time spent in learning these answers can be employed to better advantage in learning the exact words of scripture. And even if the memory would master and retain these answers, this dogmatic method of teaching would have the effect of stifling rather than of aiding the search after Christian truth.

But as a hand-book or a book of reference to be used in connection with the catechetical lectures, this catechism is suggestive and may be used with great advantage by teacher and scholars.

Among the minor points to which I take exception is the derivation of Whitsunday from White Sunday, (p. 128) for which there is not the slightest authority. And while the devotional books of other denominations are enriched by hymns from the land of Luther, it seems an excess of modesty for us Lutherans to omit them from our collections, especially when by using them we form a bond of union with our German-speaking parents and friends.

But aside from such small matters, and bearing in mind the danger arising from a servile use of any dogmatic form of statement, Dr. Conrad's catechism is an excellent little volume, for which he deserves and will doubtless receive the thanks of his brethren in the ministry.

G. U. WENNER, New York.

The value of a book is to be estimated not from its size or its cost, but from its purpose and its adaptation thereto. There is no book of merely human composition of more importance than a catechism on the Christian religion; for its place and work are fundamental for character and life. Whilst no merely human book is perfect, none requires this quality so much as such a catechism. Perhaps this is the reason so few have tried, and fewer still have succeeded, in making such a book. The

use of Luther's excellent Small Catechism has always been hampered, among English speaking people, by the great length of the answers found in it. Consequently there have been a number of attempts by individuals and committees, in various quarters, to adjust this catechism to the use of our churches in America. The most recent attempt in this direction is Dr. Conrad's "Luther's Small Catechism, Explained and Amplified."

After so many men, on all sides and in all positions, have praised this little book without stint, and it has been lauded from week to week in *The Lutheran Observer* as the great *desideratum* of our churches, it may seem presumptuous in us to question this judgment, or to point out deficiencies and errors in this catechism. On the other hand this same excessive laudation has led others to look more closely into so unparalleled a work and to be even less lenient to apparent faults than they would have been had the book been allowed modestly to speak for itself. Experience, moreover, leads us to be very chary of accepting a thing because of any names, however weighty, used to commend it. If a thing does not commend itself, no opinions of men can sustain it. Moreover, that same laudation may make it the more imperative, for the general good, that the other side be heard. There is, doubtless, much to commend in Dr. Conrad's catechism. It is the work of many years of effort, and it has gone through many experiences. Originating in the appointment of a committee by the General Synod long ago, it now comes before the public as Dr. Conrad's individual work. We desire here to record ourselves as good a friend of Dr. Conrad as any of those who have extravagantly praised his catechism, and it cannot be considered a personal matter that we feel called upon, in the brief space here given, to make some strictures upon his work. This little book is for the Church's use, and it is the Church that is to be profited or harmed by it.

1. In general, as to the style of the questions and answers of which a catechism should be composed. Every answer in a catechism should be a complete proposition, expressing the thought to be conveyed. It should involve the question so far as is necessary to that end; and the questions should be so framed as to allow this, with this in view. The Westminster

Shorter Catechism, of our Calvinistic friends, is a model in this respect. From beginning to end there is not an answer there that is not a complete proposition, and whoever has the answer has the question, without any effort to remember order or connection. *E. g.*, "What do the Scriptures principally teach?" Ans. "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man." "Into what estate did the fall bring mankind?" Ans. "The fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery." Every answer in that catechism makes complete sense. This is largely so in Luther's Catechism, properly translated, and in Frelinghuysen's "Order of Salvation." But Dr. Conrad has altogether neglected this very important matter in his catechism. There are only eleven answers in the whole book, aside from the Commandments of God and the Creed, that make complete sense of themselves. These are the answers to questions 34, 104, 175, 218, 224, 244, 266, 275, 319, 348, 382. For instance, what propositions of truth do these answers set forth: "Into the love of gratitude and of complacency," "To make false statements concerning him," "By the Holy Ghost," "We cannot," "Of Heaven"—and any others you may select. To have observed the point we make might have called for more type and more pages, perhaps, but it would have given us more the catechism we need.

2. There is an indefiniteness in many of the questions in this catechism. *E. g.*, "Why are the laws of God binding on men?" Now gravitation, magnetism, heredity, etc., are among "the laws of God:" does this question include these? "What is enjoined in this commandment?" is an oft repeated question in this book: but what commandment is meant? "What is the fear of God?" and "What are the different kinds of fear?" would be stated much more definitely in the form, What is it to fear God? and, What different kinds of fear are there? The question, "How does this commandment require us to love God?" might be answered in several ways, according as the "how" is understood. "What are some of the things belonging to God?" is a remarkable question. "How is this done?" is another. "How is the second commandment enforced?" is

asked. Well, in Pennsylvania and in many other States there is a law against profane swearing, and perjury is punished by the courts; does the question involve such enforcement? "Which day of the week is now kept as the Sabbath?" Before answering this one must ask, By whom?

3. There is an inexactness in many of the answers in this catechism. *E. g.*, "A catechism" is defined to be "A book of religious instruction in the form of questions and answers." But Bertini's catechism is not this, nor Jousse's: these are catechisms of music. There are catechisms of every science; they need not be "religious." So the definition of "A Creed" in this catechism gives a species for the genus. "Trust in God" is defined to be "such confidence in God as leads," etc. Why "*such*?" "Everything else that belongs to God" is said to be "included in the name of God." How are we, especially young people, to interpret this word "belongs" here? "To appeal to God to secure his direct interposition in the accomplishment of super-human ends" is given as a principal definition of what it is to "conjure by the name of God." Yet surely we make such an appeal whenever we ask God to create in us a clean heart and renew a right spirit within us. A comparison of questions 190 and 191 gives us the strange statement that our Saviour "assumed the nature and condition of man" "under Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor." On p. 66 "Christ's blood is called precious" "because it was the ransom paid for our redemption." Surely this is putting the effect for the cause. On p. 67 "The declaration of the word of God" is said to be "that we shall be joint heirs with Christ." But God's word emphatically declares (Rom. 8: 14-17, Gal. 4: 7) that we *are* heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. On p. 77 it is said that "Prayer consists in making our requests to God for such things as we need." Surely this is a very one-sided definition. Is prayer only begging? It is, alas, made too much so, and, instead of being taught this, people ought rather to be led to a higher plane of communion with God. On p. 84 it is said that, in the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer, "We promise to forgive those who have injured or offended us and to return good for evil." Now here that is made a future contingency which God's word makes an ante-

cedent or contemporary condition. Jesus says (Mk. 11 : 25), "And when ye stand praying, forgive," etc., using the present tense, and in Matt. 6 : 12 the true reading is, as the Revised Version has it, "As we also have forgiven our debtors" [perfect tense], and the parallel passage, in Lk. 11 : 4, has it, "For we ourselves also forgive," etc., showing forgiveness as existing and a habit—but this is very different from a promise of what we are *going to do*!

On p. 78 the answer to the question, "Who can pray with confidence that their prayers will be heard?" is, "All true believers, penitent souls, and pious children." This brings to our mind the facetious division of mankind into "saints, sinners, and the Beecher family!"

4. Some of the questions and answers of this catechism come short of the truth, or, directly or indirectly, teach error. This is seen as early as on the 2d page of the book. Is it possible that we are to believe and teach that "the significance of our baptism" is that "I therein received my Christian name, and was presented to God by my parents, who entered into covenant with him for me"—only that, and nothing more? Why, the Baptists are ready to do as much as that for their children! The next answer says of the parents, "They promised that by the help of God I would renounce my sins, believe in Jesus Christ and obey the commandments of God." Now, if any have promised that, they have promised what, in the nature of the case, it is not in their power to fulfil: no one can "covenant and promise" what another will do. The writer of this is both a Lutheran and a parent, and, when his child was baptized, he promised no such thing as is above declared. See in our formula of Baptism (Liturgy of 1856) what he did promise. Further on in this catechism it is said of the engagements in baptism, "The obligations assumed can never be revoked." Then those unfortunate parents whose wilful children refuse instruction will be forever held as "covenant-breakers" because they could not fulfil the promise to deliver over their children as penitent believers. The answers in the first edition to the repeated question, "What advantages are conferred upon chil-

dren by baptism?" are very weak, and far below Lutheran doctrine on this subject; and, although the "Revised Edition" has improved some of the statements under the head "Of Baptism," the commonly received Calvinistic view—that in the baptism of children the covenant is made with the parents—seems to be the real view of the author. But Lutheran teaching is that the covenant in baptism is in all cases made with the subject of the baptism, whether child or adult. It is the child that is sealed with the seal of the covenant, made with it, not with the parents. Hollaz. says, "The primary design of baptism is the offering, application, conferring, and sealing of evangelical grace," and this is done to the person baptized, not to his parents: and, whilst it is the faith of the parents that brings the child thus to God, "We by no means grant," as Chemnitz says, "that infants who are baptized are either without faith, or are baptized on the faith of others." This catechism teaches (p. 20) that baptized children "*become* true Christians" at some other time and in some other way than in baptism. And the use of this word "*become*," here and on p. 108, question 391, and of the word "*imposes*," on p. 106, question 383, shows that Dr. Conrad has not weighed words as carefully as he should in making a catechism.

The worst defect of the book is that noted under this head; for it is a fundamental one and is no subversive of our Lutheran church life, that it is a thousand pities there should be here even an uncertain sound, now when our Church has been coming to a better self-consciousness and appreciation of her doctrines as preëminently scriptural. The little book, happily here, is inconsistent with itself on this point of baptism, since questions 372, 389, 390, and especially the changes made in the "Revised Edition," either state or imply the true doctrine.

Another important and strange error, in a Lutheran catechism particularly, is found on p. 49, question 144, where "the original design of the law" is stated, in the first edition, to have been "to confer eternal life," and in the "Revised Edition," to "offer eternal life," etc. Where in the world did Dr. Conrad learn this? His proof passages do not establish it, and the Scriptures expressly say (Gal. 3 : 21), "For, if there had been a law

given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law," and (Rom. 3 : 20), "By the law is the knowledge of sin." The law was given after the promise: the promise was of eternal life in Jesus Christ, and the purpose of the law, as stated in Gal. 3 : 24, was to be "our schoolmaster [pedagogue] to bring us unto Christ." No law of commandments can either offer or confer eternal life. The law of life is a very different sort of law, as both nature and the Bible teach.

Such are some of the defects, as they seem to us, of this catechism. We are truly sorry to see them, but feel bound to note them. A proper criticism of the book would require much more space than is here allowed us. We are fully convinced that a Committee of parents, pastors, and teachers, could greatly improve this catechism, or make a better one.

H. L. BAUGHER, Gettysburg, Pa.

Our examination of "*Luther's Small Catechism*, explained and amplified" by Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D., has constrained us to join the large number of clergymen who have already publicly commended it.

It certainly is a great achievement in modern catechetics. It excels in arrangement, in the directness of its questions and the clearness and suggestiveness of its answers, in the fulness and relevancy of its proof-texts, in its practical and comprehensive expositions, and in its distinctively Lutheran, doctrinal and churchly character. All these characteristics have been recognized and commended in the various testimonials which have already been published. We have not as yet seen a single adverse criticism of the wonderful little book, which an enthusiastic admirer has termed "*A whole body of divinity in a nutshell, a complete manual of Evangelical Lutheranism, a brief, but comprehensive summary of Christian doctrine and practice; or the Augsburg Confession with its legitimate exponents epitomized.*"

The learned and gifted author is to be congratulated upon the excellent success which has attended his efforts to give to the Lutheran Church the catechism which our times demand.

We apprehend the difficulty of preparing an epitome which shall contain a complete body of divinity, and yet be so simple

as to meet the wants of children and youth. He who would succeed here, must be not only a thorough theologian, but also an adept in didactics.

The aim of the author has been to furnish a work for juvenile instruction, which would at the same time be adapted to the wants of the more advanced scholar and the church-member as a manual for devotion and Christian culture.

But to accomplish the latter end, it has been deemed necessary to sacrifice much of the simplicity demanded by the former.

Our juvenile, and in many places our intermediate classes, will lose interest in the study of a subject when they encounter such words as *abstract, intrinsic, inherent, super-sensual, Originistic, Capernaitic*, etc., and when they meet with statements of truth which are not readily understood.

The catechist who has to deal with those who have enjoyed but limited educational privileges, will appreciate a catechism which presents truth in the simplest possible forms.

It has long been our judgment that this instruction should be graded. We should have a serial catechism, or a series of catechisms, the last of which might serve as a manual for the Church.

The importance of this simplicity of language and statement may be realized, when we consider the prejudices which are entertained in many quarters against catechisation. A representative clergyman of the Presbyterian Church, on being interviewed with regard to this subject some time ago, remarked, "I do not think that the catechism is taught in many of our churches. *It is relegated, as it ought to be, to the theological seminaries where theology is taught.* It is not taught in our Sabbath schools. The children are taught out of the Bible, not out of the writings of men. I think it a great mistake to teach children the catechism as it was taught when I was a boy. We had to commit it to memory, and stand an examination in it *while we understood but little of the words used.* It made me hate it, and to hate Sunday and the Sunday-school."

We know of such prejudices in our own Church, and the catechism in use doubtless has much to do with their existence. Of the parts of the "New Catechism" we very much admire the

interesting, instructive and exhaustive discussion of the Apostles' Creed, the introduction to the Sacraments, the treatise on Confirmation, and the Appendix, which we consider invaluable for its information, and its able defense of the doctrines and practices of our beloved Church.

We have however, noticed several omissions, which we very much regret, to which we kindly call attention, hoping that they may be supplied in subsequent editions.

1. A discussion of the *Word of God* as the source of the truths taught in the catechism,—the titles, contents, and particularly the inspiration of the Scriptures. This will give necessary information to the catechumen, prepare him for the instruction of the catechism, and show the groundlessness of the objection, that there is little or no affinity between it and the Bible. If the true relation of the catechism to the Word of God is more carefully emphasized, there will be less objection to its use as "a Bible for the laity."

2. In the answer to question 163, some of the attributes ascribed to God in the Scriptures are omitted. Why not add eternity, omnipresence, invisibility, incomprehensibility, etc.? They are all involved in the subsequent instructions of the catechism.

3. A statement of the duties of church-members, either in amplification of the treatise on Confirmation, or in the Appendix. Our Formula of Government and Discipline is very limited on this topic, and as the design of catechisation is to prepare our youth for full church-membership, it seems to us that a liberal discussion of these duties in the catechism would be orderly and helpful.

It may be objected that these additions would enlarge the work to an undesirable size, but surely we cannot sacrifice the wants of the soul and the Church for the sake of brevity and convenience, nor should we cater to the foolish prejudices of men, when no pains of labor or expense are shared in the promotion of secular education. We should be as liberal as the world in preparing, publishing and using our religious textbooks.

We hail the advent of the "New Catechism" with joy. We

greet it with a hearty welcome, and bid it God-speed in its mission of light and love. We trust that it shall awaken a deeper interest in the time-honored custom of the indoctrination of our youth, and that it shall be used as a "manual of devotion" by the entire Church, even as the great Reformer has taught us by his own example.

B. F. ALLEMAN, Shippensburg, Pa.

[One of the gentlemen engaged to take part in this Symposium, one whose judgment in such a matter is of great weight, was prevented by the pressure of pastoral duties and other ecclesiastical engagements from giving the subject the attention which it requires and wrote a few days before our going to press, as follows:—Ed.]

I am sorry that I cannot write as I hoped. Only ten services last week, and this week about ten or more solid hours to—

I commenced the work but as I could not do it thoroughly gave it up. I observed the Dr. does not deal with the truths of original sin and justification by faith. His exposition of the Second and Third articles of the Creed are very meagre and are no real commentary on the explanation of Luther.

Much of the work is done well, apt definition in concise language.

It was promised in the last issue of the QUARTERLY that at least *ten* pastors and professors would participate in this Symposium. These ten were selected and their several contributions were expected up to the time when all which have arrived were placed in the printer's hands. At the last hour, therefore, one of the editors is compelled with much reluctance to take part in this discussion—not indeed as a substitute for three absentees, but to approximate more nearly the numerical promise made to our readers.

The proper subject now before the Church, let it be remembered, is not Dr. Conrad, in personal esteem for whom the writer yields to no one, nor indeed his catechism *per se*, with many of the tributes to which, as published in the *Observer* we readily agree. But the supreme issue that claims the attention of the Church, is whether this shall be *our* catechism; whether the General Synod shall at its next convention in June adopt

this as its own catechism, investing it with the authority of a Creed by authorizing its use as a text-book for the indoctrination of the young.

Without entering here upon the full scope of the essentials of a Lutheran Catechism (for this, the reader is referred to the excellent article of Dr. Ziegler who in the sphere of catechetics has no superior in our bounds) we will name just a few of these requisites in the three following self-evident propositions:

I. *It should be restricted to the elements of the faith, excluding what is essentially controversial or speculative.*

II. *Its teachings must be theologically and historically correct.*

III. *Its definitions must be adequate, unambiguous and expressed in simple language.*

Now with the catechism in hand, let the reader apply these propositions respectively to the answers which are put by the author into the mouths of the catechumens, and if he has had training in Lutheran theology and in clear thinking, he will probably reach the conclusion that the following, among others, do not bear the test.

The last clause of the Answer to Quest. 5 is disallowed by III. It is inadequate. The Sacraments are not merely assurances, they are *means*, of grace.

The Ans. to 10 is disallowed by II. and III. The primary agent in a covenant with God, is always God himself, and the principal action in a sacrament is the divine action. Men are the recipients rather than the sole agents in a sacramental rite. Here man is made to do all, God's part is ignored.

22 and 24 taken together are condemned by III. The former solemnly makes the laws of God binding on all men. The latter makes "the ceremonial laws" which in 18 are called "laws of God" "not binding on us." And 25 falls under the same judgment, while the failure to name what laws are "ceremonial" leaves the whole subject in the greatest confusion. 28 and 29 are rejected by I. And not only are they out of place here, but there is a third division which is more logical than either of those mentioned.

45 and 47 do not stand the test of III.

Does the name of God "include" "everything else that be-

longs to him"? And why speak in this connection of "his word and day" * * "his ministers and people" as "belonging to God" when the Scriptures say "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof!" 49 and 51 fall under the sentence of both II. and III. They represent both confusion and inaccuracy. The former mentions "swearing" "in and by the name of God" as one of the forms of "taking God's name in vain." The latter recognizes swearing as a proper appeal to God. The latter half of 54 is condemned by both II. and III. "To appeal to God to secure his direct interposition" is not in itself conjuration. Every man calling on God for salvation prays for his "direct interposition in the accomplishment of superhuman ends." Besides, if the teaching were correct, how many catechumens understand such terms (III)?

70 falls short of III. Reading Scripture and other religious literature is a very appropriate employment for the Lord's Day.

71 falls below what is required in II. "Recreation and pleasure," if proper in kind and degree, are not profanations of God's day.

75 is not in accord with II. There is no warrant for saying that "the first day of the week" is observed "in honor of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit." Certainly the only proof text offered says nothing of the kind.

81 is not "expressed in simple language." The latter part of 87 violates II. If all were "to follow the example" of their pastors, it would be a bad day for some churches. Both Jesus (Matt. 23 : 3) and Paul (I. Cor. 11 : 1) gave advice in conflict with Dr. Conrad's.

156, stating that the Apostles' Creed is due in part to the fact that "the prevalence of errors required opposing statements of truth" is not in accord with II. 159 is not in accord with III, neither is 162. To define "Almighty" by "Omnipotence" is not a model of simplicity.

176 is in violation of both II. and III. It is not by "creation" that God "preserved to me my body with all its members." 177 states correctly that "He has preserved my life" "by his providence," although there confusion is again introduced by ascribing to God's providence the gift of "all that I possess."

What, here, belongs to "Creation" and what to "Providence?" 190 and 191 combined violate II. and III. If by our Lord's "suffering" we are to understand, in part, the "assuming the nature" of man, this did not occur "under Pontius Pilate."

195 is ruled out by I. and though Luther held this idea, his two catechisms as well as the Form of Concord (Chap. 9) show that he had no idea of introducing the discussion of this mystery in the instruction of the young.

206 is disallowed under III.

209 is not in harmony with either I. or II. That the Son is "begotten of the Father" and that there is an order of *origin*, corresponding in the case of the Son with the "Procession" of the Holy Ghost has been the faith of Christendom for 1600 years. This does not make him "inferior to the Father," hence it is very misleading to combine the two ideas in one question.

Question 210 is confusion confounded. Who ever heard of the "distinction between him as the Son of *Man* and the Father" being at all questioned or discussed since the Sabellian controversy? Dr. Conrad certainly would distinguish in thought between Son of God and Son of Man. This answer is a virtual denial of the personal distinctions within the Godhead.

211 does violence either to II. or to III. If it is meant that "Christ should be divine" "in order that through death he might be a propitiation," etc., as is attempted to be proven by citing the passage Heb. 2 : 9, then the necessity of our Lord's divinity is confounded with that of his humanity, and the proof passage really refers not to the divine pre-existence of the Son with the Father, but to the incarnation, and ought to have been used at 213. If the author meant to teach that the divinity was necessary to give his sufferings infinite value and to make them efficacious for "the sins of the whole world" why does he not say so in unmistakable language? This answer is one of a number that has been submitted to the ablest Professors at Gettysburg, who after studying the language for some minutes, say, in substance, "Well, if he means so and so, the statement may stand. *But* if his idea aims at presenting, etc., etc." Now if these Doctors are not sure of the author's

meaning, what can the average pastor do, and the poor children?

233 fails under II. and III. It ascribes "names, attributes and works" of God to the Holy Spirit, but fails to mention "worship" as in the case of the Son, Quest. 207. Why this very serious omission? It is the first time we have seen such omission in an argument for the Spirit's divinity.

239 is excluded by I. So is 242. When Lutheran Doctors shall have finished their controversies on the "Communion of Saints" it will be time to propose it to the innocent youths that study the catechism. The distinction between the external organization and the totality of believers can and ought to be taught, but not in this style. 255 both Question and Answer fail to meet test III.

263 is condemned by II. As the proof passage correctly has it, "He that believeth * * has everlasting life." The answer says incorrectly that it will be given "after the resurrection." True, these are Luther's words, but in an "amplification" of his catechism and in connection with this proof passage we expect a modification, showing that the life in God begins here while the consummation is not reached till after the resurrection. 274 is not adequate. (III.) What are soldiers to do as they are on the eve of battle—or the occupants of crowded tenement houses? Paul enjoins men to "pray everywhere."

276 fails under test II. There is not a particle of evidence that Christ ever "conducted the worship of the synagogues." He taught in them but he never presided over these Jewish assemblies.

277 is likewise incorrect. The Lord's Prayer is *not* "the true source of all devotional forms and liturgical services in Christendom." The Psalms have contributed far more material to the Liturgies.

302 is not an "adequate" interpretation of the sixth petition, which does not ask to be saved from temptation but begs God not to "lead us into" it.

314, as in nearly all the other references to the import of the Sacraments, care seems to have been taken to avoid the precise expressions in which Lutheran Theology abounds, such as "confer," "convey," "communicate," &c.; instead of these always

something vague like "signify," "assure," "seal," etc. Hence violating test II. and reminding one of Crypto-Calvinism and the Heidelberg Catechism which make the nearest possible approach to the Lutheran doctrine without stating it explicitly and unequivocally.

316 does not harmonize with III. probably not with II.—it depends upon what is meant. Half of the pastors will not understand it and many will vow that this is the *ex opere operato* doctrine of Romanism which the Reformers renounced with horror. 315 says "without true faith" the use of the sacraments will "prove of *none effect*." This says their "intrinsic efficacy" depends "not upon the faith of the recipients." Certainly in the important doctrine which is doubtless here in the author's mind precise terminology is accessible and most desirable.

323 is ruled out by proposition I. It is to be regretted that such expressive phraseology as "means through which grace is conferred" and the "Spirit operating through perceptible vehicles," is not employed where the Lutheran conception of the Sacraments is treated.

328 fails by its ambiguity (III.).

339 denies the validity of Lay-baptism. Hence it conflicts with II. Or if Dr. C. admits Lay-baptism when necessary, this answer does not meet requirement III.

The last clause of 351 is in violation of II. cf. 1 Cor. 10 : 16. Not the enjoyment of "communion with each other," but the fact that the cup is the communion of the blood of Christ and the bread the communion of the body, led to the designation of the Supper by "Communion."

352 is also lacking in distinct historic accuracy. "The table set for the distribution of the supper" received the name of *altar*, says Neander, "so early as the time of Tertullian."

356 does not meet the test of either I. or III.

In 363 and elsewhere prayer is spoken of as a mere spiritual exercise. This is not in keeping with II and III.

372, 375 and 391 are condemned by II. The ratification of baptismal vows by the confirmant is not the historic significance of confirmation.

376 cannot stand before II. If there is on earth any evidence that this is the origin of confirmation we should be extremely glad to get a sight of it.

379 cannot be harmonized with III. Is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ not embraced "in a true profession of religion?"

This is not offered as an exhaustive examination, but it will suffice to indicate the writer's conviction that this catechism, with all its merits, has not reached the superlative degree. If the reader has, as suggested to him, followed the writer with the catechism in hand, he most likely shares this conclusion. We are sorry to disagree to such an extent with so many pastors and professors who have published in the *Observer* strong endorsements of this work, but we are quite confident that the author himself will cheerfully accept most of the above corrections when his attention shall be called to them. A man of Dr. Conrad's candor and ardent church love is a good deal more anxious for the Church to have the best possible catechism than for himself personally to receive the praise of men.

E. J. WOLF, Gettysburg, Pa.

[The following was received just as the printer finished the preceding paper, the first paragraph of which indicated that it would close the series. Though this came late, we are glad it was not too late to appear with the rest.—ED.]

It cannot be expected of an author of a text-book that he shall adopt all the criticisms and suggestions of those who teach. His chief aim should be to treat the subject in hand in the most accurate and comprehensive manner, and in a way suited to those for whom it is prepared.

These requirements are hard to meet in a catechism. On the one hand it must deal with all the profound doctrines of the Bible, and all the vexed questions of theology; and on the other hand, it must so treat these subjects as to be understood by the immature mind of the child. Hence great care is necessary in every detail of such a book.

There is much to admire in the work we have in hand. At first we wonder at the generally striking aptness of the scripture quotations. This led us to the commendable conclusion that

the questions and answers were taken directly from the Scripture. This is solid ground, and is the chief merit of the book.

Then there are only a few but pointed references, and these are quoted. Many references make a catechism appear formidable to a child. If they are quoted, they make the book bulky, and are not all committed, and if they are merely referred to they are not looked up. The child is satisfied with one plain, printed proof text.

But our task lies more in the line of suggestion and criticism, than of commendation. Our space being limited, we proceed at once to offer a few thoughts of suggestion wherein we think the book might be improved.

We would omit questions 10, 11, and 12 out of the introduction, and make them prefatory to part IV. where they properly belong. Questions 28 and 29 ought to be omitted. They are not relevant to the subject. Moreover they gender discussion where none is necessary. The division of the commandments is arbitrary, and we see far more reason for rejecting than accepting the Augustinian method. The first commandment, as we have it here, expresses two distinct thoughts. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" forbids *subjective* idolatry. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image" forbids *objective* idolatry. This of itself ought to decide the matter. But the ninth and tenth commandments, on the other hand, are expressive of only one thought—*covetousness*. The "neighbor's house" in the ninth would group as well with "wife" and "servants" in the tenth as these do with "ox" and "ass," and surely "house" is included in the last clause of the tenth, "nor *anything* that is thy neighbor's." We have often wondered why Luther followed the Augustinian division. It may have been a delicate question in his day. Besides, our author is not himself consistent with his division. He finds it necessary in answer to question 41 to speak of a "literal" and a "spiritual" idolatry. If however it should be decided best to analyze the first commandment in this way, then we would reverse the order, and place "spiritual" before "literal," and then reverse the order of questions 42 and 43. Idolatry is first "spiritual"—conceived in the heart—before it is "literal"—wrought out in the religious life.

We would answer question 160 differently. We would omit "God is love." Love is only *one* of God's attributes, standing in the same relation to his nature as "justice," "holiness," etc. We would also omit the indefinite article "a," as is done in the first edition. God is not so well defined by saying he is *a* spirit, one of the spirits, as by simply saying he is *a spirit*. The word *πνεῦμα* in the original of the proof text, John 4 : 24, stands in the position of emphatic first in the sentence, and refers to the immaterial, spiritual nature of God. The meaning is; that God is spirit in the highest and truest sense, and nothing but spirit. We would answer, "God is spirit, a self-existent, infinite, and perfect being." (We find our rendering of this passage, John 4 : 24, in the marginal note of the new version).

Not all the attributes are named in answer to question 163. Omnipresence is notably omitted. No less to us is God's all-presence, than his all-power. We would add to the proof text of question 277, "After this *manner*, therefore, pray ye," Matt. 6 : 9. This, then, would justify the assertion made in the last part of the answer.

In the answer to question 334 we prefer the word "merciful" used in the first edition, as being more scriptural and intelligible than the word "spiritual" in the new edition. Both words might be omitted.

We do not understand the answer to question 353. The grammar is bad. The antecedent of "which" and "it" may be something understood, suggested by the question. But as the sentence stands it is bad. "Which" would have to refer to "bread and wine." It is not the "institution" that is administered, but the "bread and wine." Nor is the "institution" the "communion of the body and blood of Christ." It is the "administration" of the "bread and wine," together with the use of the words of institution, that becomes the "communion of the body and blood of Christ." But why add this last clause? The things which "*constitute*"—"establish," "compose," "make up," or "give formal expression" to the Lord's Supper, are plainly, "the bread and wine," and the "words of institution." The "Lord's Supper" is the "communion of the body and blood of

Christ." These terms are synonymous. Would not the question be better answered by saying, "Of bread and wine, and their proper administration by (or in) the use of the words of institution?"

This last clause answers the question more fully, already partially answered under 350, "What is the Lord's Supper?" Or we might introduce a new question, "How is the Lord's Supper regarded by the Lutheran Church?" Ans. "As the communion of the body and blood of Christ." And here we would let the subject rest. We would omit questions 355, 356 and 357—especially 357. It is contrary to the spirit of Lutheranism to attempt further definition. The tenets of our Christianity, and the interpretation of the same by our articles of confession, are satisfied with the above answer. It is the "communion of the body and blood of Christ," but *how*, or in *what manner*, it is un-Lutheran to declare; and an attempt at definition only genders controversy and causes misunderstanding. Any way, even if theologians are permitted to discuss such questions, they are out of place in a book intended for the instruction of the young.

This leads us to anticipate a thought in conclusion which will be in place here, viz: that there is too much space given to, and too much stress laid upon the *sacraments*, which are secondary, being *means of grace*, as compared with the space and stress given the doctrines of sin, repentance, faith, etc., which bear more directly upon salvation itself. We do think that the *conditions* of salvation might receive a larger share of the author's notice.

And yet, while the sacraments are given a prominent place in the book, we might agree to something in addition—if that something were confined to the legitimate discussion of *how* the sacraments become means of grace.

Luther had a very profound view of the sacraments, but when drawn out into a scientific statement, he found himself subject to misunderstanding. Hence his appeal always was, to the "*words of institution*." Here, and here alone, was he safe. And only here can we do justice to the doctrine, and maintain that spirit of harmony so much desired amongst ourselves, and with all of God's people. We only add, that it seems strange that in

an "explanation of Luther's catechism," Luther's own definition of the Lord's Supper does not appear.

In answer to question 379, we have among the things embraced in a "true profession of religion," "truths to be believed." In answer to question 380, these "truths" are said to be "set forth in the Apostles' Creed, and the Augsburg Confession." Why not omit this whole quotation? The truths may indeed be set forth both in the Apostles' Creed, and in our Confession, and yet both are compilations of men, and neither, as a whole, was necessary to a "true profession of religion" in apostolic times.

Not so much objection can be urged against the words, "Apostles' Creed;" for we make the Apostles' Creed a part of our form of confirmation. But would our esteemed author call only that a "true profession of religion," which must receive the doctrines of the gospel as "set forth in the Augsburg Confession?" We think he does not mean this. Do not those make a "true profession" who believe in the "fundamental doctrines of the gospel" as set forth in the Westminster Confession?

Here again discussion is provoked where there is no need. The question might be asked, "To what statement of doctrine does the Lutheran Church hold?" Ans. "To that given in the Augsburg Confession."

Answer to question 385 might be much simpler. Why trouble the child's mind about "theoretic faith" about which it knows nothing. The child's faith is simple saith. We would also here add a few questions additional, such as would rise out of the proof texts under question 385. Faith is a most important doctrine, and eminent in Lutheran theology.

But the space allotted us compels us to conclude this very brief and imperfect examination. We add a few thoughts in general.

Many of the answers might be simpler and shorter. The plan of the book might be much improved by a more systematic arrangement in the order of salvation—a need in all our catechisms. All that is said of any one topic ought to be brought together in one place. More prominence ought to be given to the *conditions of salvation*. Some subjects might be more fully

treated. Nothing is said of the division of the Church into "visible" and "invisible," "militant" and "triumphant." Only one question is asked concerning the resurrection of the body. As a catechism we would omit all after page 108. As a handbook for the parent and teacher it may be useful.

We feel that, having space only for a few criticisms, we have not done justice to the many good qualities of the book. We are thankful for it, and hope it may attain the highest perfection possible to human minds and hearts.

J. M. CROMER, Kansas City, Mo.

NOTE.—On p. 290, line 6, instead of "he is a *spirit*," read "he is *spirit*."

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTES ON THE "*TE DEUM*."

By REV. J. E. BUSHNELL, A. M., Roanoke, Va.

The *Te Deum Landamus*, used in our service of praise, is one of the richest and most precious hymns of the Church. Its authorship, however, can not be fully determined. Some attribute it to Ambrose, of Milan, though he most likely translated and revised this poetic treasure, gathering the original from an older Greek source. Some call the *Te Deum*, *Hymnus* SS. Ambrosii et Augustini. It certainly introduces us to the Ambrosian period of church history, by reason of its recognized use, marking the musical and liturgical revival of this era. Contemporaneous writers left a number of hymns remarkable for beauty, richness and scriptural devotion, with no lack of popular power and simplicity of style.

Ambrose introduced a musical reform and encouraged congregational singing. Before this the singing was performed by choirs to which the congregation gave only short responses, and the song service consisted of a monotonous, unregulated and artless recitation of the appointed psalms and prayers.

It is helpful and interesting to make a brief mention of the man, under whose influence the new impulse was given to congregational music, wherein the saving and evangelical truths of

God's Word were brought out by simple and popular songs for public instruction in the Gospel, with proper churchly regard to confession and prayer in the praise service. Ambrose, generally known as the good Bishop of Milan, belonged to a rich Roman family and was educated for the forum. While serving as the commissioned governor of Milan, a fierce contest, between contending church factions, arose concerning the election of a bishop. The Governor went to the church to maintain order and was addressing the crowd, when a child cried out—*Ambrosius Episcopus!* The multitude took this voice of a child for the voice of God and Ambrose left the judicial bench to occupy the episcopal chair so unexpectedly set before him. He was immediately baptized, and eight days after, Dec. 7th, 374, was consecrated Bishop of Milan; and like Zacchæus, when called by the Lord, he bequeathed his wealth to the poor and became rich in loving service. He discharged his duties with truly apostolic zeal, and proved a father to the poor, a protector of the oppressed, an untiring pastor and an able defender against both heresy and heathenism. The eloquence which he had formerly displayed in the forum became more brilliant when employed in the service of Christ. * * To affability and gentleness he joined a firmness which neither the fear of men, nor threats and dangers could shake. (*Kurtz's Ch. Hist.*) Truly such a one could say, "For mine own part, I wish so to order my conversation in the world, that I may live when I am dead—in the affections of the best; and leave an honorable testimony in the consciences of the worst; that I may oppress none and do good to all; that I may neither be ashamed to live, nor afraid to die."

When we consider the consecrated life of Ambrose, it is no wonder that God should put a new song in his mouth. Most likely the *Te Deum*, handed down from the early Church, grew in beauty and richness in such a spiritual atmosphere, as did the *Gloria in Excelsis* under the touch of holy hands.

Having been used in its present form for fourteen centuries and treasured by the universal Church to this day, we can not over-estimate the fellowship of that great company which has been strengthened and comforted in its use. In these modern

times, when hymns that barely touch the Master's outer garment are in the popular favor, we do well to remember that no gospel songs of this century surpass the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Gloria Patri* and the *Te Deum Laudamus*, for scriptural simplicity, spiritual power and gospel instruction. The *Te Deum* lays the believer's head upon the Master's bosom, while the grateful soul breathes the very spirit of heaven.

The three-fold division :

(1) The first nine verses, ending with "The noble army of the martyrs praise thee," constitute a *Hymn of Praise to God*. In this service of thanksgiving, the *Te Deum* brings together earth and heaven, with all the powers therein; for angels, apostles, prophets and martyrs become a great cloud of witnesses about us while we worship the Lord of Hosts.

(2) The following ten verses constitute a Confession of Faith, after the teaching of the Apostles' Creed. Here we confess our faith in the Holy Trinity—Father, Son and Spirit, and also our faith in the human birth and sacrificial death of Christ, who humbled himself to be born of a virgin. Again we acknowledge Christ's mediatorial reign and look for his glorious return to be our Saviour and Judge. What gospel hymn of modern times is more rich in saving truth than these precious lines?

(3) At the beginning of the third part it is the recognized usage in some churches to kneel, since the closing ten verses are a *Solemn Prayer*. Here all say, or sing: "We therefore pray thee, help thy servants, whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood."

This is manifestly the worship of Christ, as is taught in the words, "And we worship thy name ever world without end." The prayer is in the very language of scripture and is in the spirit of the Publican, whose simple appeal touched the Master's heart, rather than the more self-complacent language of the Pharisee. As in the *Kyrie*, so here we pray: "O Lord, have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us." The most ignorant and the sinner who is too conscience stricken to look up, may utter this prayer. In his evil hour, when God's anger was poured out, David could say, "Have mercy upon me, O God;" and so the Church would teach all to pray.

A careful and earnest study of the *Te Deum*, as a beautiful hymn, a scriptural confession of faith in Christ, and a simple prayer, shows us that our fathers and mothers, in the church of the 4th century, found their guidance in the clear and heavenly teaching of God's revealed truth, rather than in the uncertain conditions of personal and subjective experiences. Man's heart, at best, is deceitful, but God's word is fixed forever in the life and love of incarnate truth, set before us in the holy gospels. The hymns of the early Christians were written upon an open Bible and were sung in the spirit of scriptural worship; and not for mere musical effect, nor to fill up the time between speakers and keep the crowd busy, as is so commonly observed in modern gospel meetings.

The major and minor doxologies—the *Gloria in Excelsis* and *Gloria Patri*, with the *Te Deum*, the *Litany* and like treasures, are the gold of the Gospel seven times refined. The language, where it seems heavy with age, is often the very expression of holy writ, as contrasted with more modern thought. We open our Bibles and find almost the same words, and always the same teaching. Thus it is that these old hymns run their course and seem to lose light and power in the border-land of western glory; but to every new born soul, the Sun of Righteousness rises ever new with the return of each successive day-dawn.

Hence we treasure the old hymns of the Church, so full of Christ and his saving grace. Hence we give place to the *Te Deum Landamus* at each glad season of National Thanksgiving and whenever its use is helpful.

May God tune our hearts while we sing praise to him whose redeeming love hath exalted us to the power and influence of a great people in this Christian land. With the Church of our Fathers, let us sing:

"We praise the, O God."

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians*, by F. Godet, translated from the French by Rev. A. Cusin, M. A. *System of Christian Certainty*, by Dr. Fr. H. R. Frank, translated from the German by Rev. Maurice J. Evans. *The Self-Revelation of God*, by Samuel Harris, D. D. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, by John Hutchinson, D. D. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VIII, by Rev. A. Roberts, D. D., and Jas. Donaldson, LL. D. (edition by The Christian Literature Co.) *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, by Philip Schaff, from same Co. *Statements Theological and Critical*, by Daniel D. Whedon, D. D., LL. D. *Essays, Reviews and Discourses*, by Daniel D. Whedon, D. D., LL. D. *An American Commentary on the New Testament*, by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D. *Christ in the Heart*, and other Sermons, by Alex. Maclaren, D. D. *Current Discussions in Theology*, by the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary, Vol. IV. *The Throne of Grace*, a Call to Prayer, by M. Rhodes, D. D. *The People's Bible*, Discourses upon Holy Scripture, by Jos. Parker, D. D., Vol. V. *Commentary on the Psalms*, by Prof. Delitzsch, (the Foreign Biblical Library, edited by Rev. W. R. Nicoll). *Daniel I.-VI.*, an Exposition, by the Very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. *Theology of Evolution*, a Lecture, by E. D. Cope, A. M., Ph. D.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*The Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science Examined*, by Thos. M. Herbert, M. A. *Some Problems of Philosophy*, by Archibald Alexander. *Creation or Evolution*, by George Ticknor Curtis. *The Geographical and Geological Distribution of Animals*, by Angelo Heilprin. *Common Sense Science*, by Grant Allen. *Introduction to Psychological Theory*, by Borden P. Bowne. *The Conception of the Infinite*, a Study in Psychological Analysis, by George S. Fullerton, A. M., B. D. *Realistic Philosophy*, by Jas. McCosh, D. D., LL. D., Vol. I. Expository, Vol. II. Historical and Critical. *Descartes and His School*, by Kuno Fisher, translated by J. P. Gordy, Ph. D., Edited by Noah Porter, D. D., LL. D. *Psychology*, by John Dewey, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Michigan University. *Moral Philosophy*, a Series of Lectures, by Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., LL. D.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Life of Thomas Hart Benton*, by Theodore Rosefelt. *A History of the Papacy during the Period of the*

Reformation, by M. Creighton, M. A., Vols. III. and IV. *A History of Modern Europe*, by C. A. Tyffe, M. A., Vol. II.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*, with a Survey of Mediaeval Education, by S. S. Laurie, LL. D. *What shall we do with the Sunday School as an Institution*, by Geo. Lansing Taylor, D. D. *Letters from Heaven*, translated from the 4th German edition. *The Mormon Puzzle and How to Solve it*, by Rev. R. W. Beers, A. M. *Social Studies*, by R. Heber Newton. *Masters of the Situation*, Secrets of Power and Success, by W. J. Tilley, D. D. *Outlines of International Law*, by Geo. B. Davis, U. S. A.

GERMAN.

THEOLOGICAL.—*Die Lehre vom Gebet nach dem Neuen Testament*. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss und Würdigung des ursprünglichen Christenthums. Paul Christ. pp. 98. Leiden. *Christliche Eschatologie*. Th. Kliefoth. pp. 351. Leipsic. *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*. R. F. Grau. pp. 393. Nördlingen. Van Oosterzee's *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 2d enlarged Edition. pp. 279. *Der Gottesbegriff in der Gegenwart und Zukunft*. Ein Versuch zur Verständigung. M. R. v. Stern. pp. 128. Zurich. *Die christlichen Centralideen des Reiches Gottes und Erlösung*. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Nichttheologen dargestellt. Dr. Hugo Raehse. pp. 48. Halle. *Die Zehn Geboten Gottes in Predigten*. Dr. Emil Frommel (Hof-pred.) 5. verb. Auflage. pp. 213. Barmen.

BIBLICAL.—*Bilder aus dem Leben des Apostels Paulus*. Nachgezeichnet. Rud. Ehlers. pp. 255. Frankfort a. M. In Strack and Zöckler's "*Kurzgefasster Kommentar*" des Neuen Testaments the second volume contains Das Evangelium nach Johannes und Die Apostelgeschichte, erläutert von Proff. DD. Ernst Chr. Luthardt und Otto Zöckler. pp. 284. Nördlingen. *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Dr. Bernh. Weiss. pp. 652. Berlin. *Biblische Chronologie und Zeitrechnung der Hebräer*. E. Mahler. pp. 204. Vienna. *Die Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für die christliche Predigt*. Past. Lic. Ernst Bindemann. pp. 346. Gütersloh. *Cremer's Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Griech.* 5. Aufl. I. Drittel. pp. 304. Gotha. Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 2d improved and enlarged edition. pp. 560. Freiburg i. Br.

HISTORICAL.—*Die Religionen der Völker*. Nach den besten Forschungsergebnissen bearb. 3. Buch. A. Reichenbach. pp. 243-358. Munich. *Verfassung, Cultus und Disciplin der christlichen Kirche* nach den Schriften Tertullians. Dr. Jos. Priest. Hohlberg. pp. 226. Braunschweig. *Die Unionspolitik Landgraf Philipps* des grossmüthigen von Hessen und die Unterstützung der Hugenotten im ersten Religionskrieg. Dr. Arth. Heidenhain. pp. 122. Breslau. Vol. III. of Ritchl's

Geschichte des Pietismus. Der Pietismus in der luther. Kirche d. 17 u. 18. Jahrh. 2. Abth. pp. 469. Bonn. Vol. II. of Witte's *Leben Dr. F. A. G. Tholuck's*, 1826-1877. pp. 563. Bielefeld. *Spanische Glaubenshelden.* Reformations-bilder. E. Christ. pp. 312. Basel. *Die Naturvölker.* Missverständnisse, Missdeutungen und Misshandlungen. 2. Tle. Dr. Wilh. Schneider. pp. 310, 501. Paderborn.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Beiträge Zur Geographie Palestinas.* Doc. Dr. Hildesheimer. pp. 93. Berlin. *Die weibliche Diakonie* in ihrem ganzen Umfang dargestellt. Th. Schäfer. 2. Aufl. 1. Bd. Die Geschichte der weiblichen Diakonie. pp. 328. Stuttgart. *Die Macht des Gebets* mit besonderer Beziehung auf *Krankenheilung.* L. Lemme. pp. 118. Barmen. *Die Sittenlehre des Darwinismus.* Eine Kritik der Ethik Herbert Spencers. Vict. Cathrein. S. J. pp. 146. Freiburg i. Br. *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*, im Anschluss an Luther dargestellt. Prof. Dr. W. Herrman. pp. 205. Stuttgart. *Die Wendung zur Wahrheit in der Modernen Kulterentwicklung.* A. Bärthold. pp. 80. Gütersloh. *Ein Ritt in das gelobte Land.* Land und Leute in Palestina vor 3000 Jahren. A. Thoma. pp. 155. Berlin. *Einwärts, Aufwärts, Vorwärts!* Pilgergedanken und Lebenserfahrungen. Dr. Max Frommel. pp. 227. Bremen.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes. By Geerhardus Vos, Fellow of Princeton Theological Seminary. With an Introduction by Professor William Henry Green. 1886. pp. 270.

This treatise, we are told in Dr. Green's Introduction, was prepared as a thesis in competition for the Hebrew Fellowship in the Princeton Seminary. The Fellowship being awarded to him, he is now pursuing his studies at the University of Berlin. The high merits of the treatise undoubtedly justify its appearance in this neat volume. The subject discussed is the Mosaic origin of the laws of the Pentateuch, a subject which the destructive critics of the Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen school have brought into great prominence and importance. Mr. Vos has presented the essential points in debate with remarkable clearness. His treatment shows a thorough acquaintance with the whole literature of the subject, and unusual skill in using it for the maintenance of the Mosaic authority of the Pentateuchal codes. But we cannot give the character and merits of the book better than by quoting from Dr. Green's introductory statement:

"It will be found that the discussion in this little volume is neither narrow nor superficial. It is not a summary of results hastily gathered from compendiums at second hand, but it is drawn from the direct study of original sources. The views of the leading critics are concisely stated on the various points raised in the controversy, substantially as they present them themselves. These are uniformly treated with eminent candor and fairness, while at the same time their weakness and fallacy are skilfully exposed. The book makes no pretensions to be an exhaustive exhibition of the subject. It will not, of course, prove a substitute for more elaborate and extended works; though, to those who are entering upon the study, it will be an admirable introduction to them. And for such as wish to gain a general knowledge of the present state of critical questions concerning the Pentateuch, the range of the discussion, and the arguments employed on each side, I do not know where a more satisfactory exhibition can be found, of what intelligent readers would wish to learn, in so small a compass."

M. V.

Representative English Prose and Prose Writers. By Theodore W. Hunt, Ph. D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Language in the College of New Jersey, Author of "The Principles of Written Discourse," etc. pp. xiii, 527.

This is a thoroughly good book and worthy of a more extended notice than can here be given it. It is divided into three parts: I. Representative Historic Periods, in which the *disjecta membra* of treatises on English literature are joined together and appear as a living and growing body; II. Representative Literary Forms, treating of the different kinds of prose as historical, philosophical, oratorical, &c.; III. Representative Prose Writers, where the styles of Bacon, Milton, Addison, Macaulay, Carlyle and others are carefully analyzed and estimated. The whole work has a practical value and, while giving a more satisfactory view of English literature than most so-called Histories of the subject, may serve students as an advanced work on rhetoric. The style is clear, temperate and well suited for didactic purposes. There is none of that affected brilliancy which is so often associated with indifference to truth and moral recklessness. The reader feels that the author has supreme regard for truth and good morals and that he is a safe guide. As a critic he is humane and sympathetic, and evidently takes more pleasure in giving a favorable than an unfavorable judgment.

Teachers of English literature and pupils too may take satisfaction in the marked tendency towards a more systematic presentation of the subject. Of this tendency the volume before us is one of the best illustrations.

The City Youth. By J. Thain Davidson, D. D., Author of "Talks with Young Men," "Forewarned—Forearmed," etc. pp. 291. 1887.

Dr. Davidson has shown by his previous volumes addressed to the

young that he possesses uncommon gifts to reach the attention and hold the interest of this element in society. The present work is a collection of twenty sermons chiefly intended for lads of from sixteen to twenty years of age, who have left the parental roof, and have gone up to push their way in the busy crowded city.

The author has a deep and broad insight into the heart of youth, he knows how to lay bare the hidden springs of human action and character, and to paint worldliness and selfishness with the hideous tints that belong to them; and best of all he shows the sympathy of a Christian man with the weak, the tempted and the imperiled.

The style is simple, animated and forceful, solid and wholesome counsel being enlivened by illustration and story which make the book as attractive as it is earnest, evangelical and helpful. It is one of those books that ought to go into every family and Sunday-school library.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

The Self-Revelation of God. By Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. pp. 570. 1887.

In this volume we are favored with a work which belongs to the higher order of theological productions. Both the subject and its treatment put it among the notable works of the day. The subject is the most important one involved in the speculative thought of our age. The treatment is able, earnest, candid and thorough, under the light of the latest scientific and philosophical research.

It is not intended as specifically a treatise on natural theology, nor distinctively as an exhibit of the Christian evidences. It seeks rather to unite what is fundamental in both. The place it is meant to occupy is between that of the purely metaphysical grounds of theological truth as treated in the author's work, *The Philosophical Basis of Theism*, and that usually covered by special treatises on "the Evidences of Christianity." It is intended as an exposition of the generic features of the whole self-revelation of God in both nature and redemption. Its high aim is not only to show such self-revelation to be reasonable, but to make the fact of it clear and certain, by an exhibition of its necessary and actual characteristics, in its whole range and all its modes, whether called natural or supernatural.

In Part I. Dr. Harris considers the origin and nature of the knowledge of God. It is shown to rise as a spontaneous belief developed in man's experience. This, however, is not primarily man's finding God, but God's coming to man in self-disclosure through such given experiences. The fundamental principle is that revelation is always and necessarily from the divine side, from some divine action or influence by which God makes himself known to man. Creation, in all its parts and movements,

is divine self-manifestation. Through their experience He becomes an object of knowledge to men, because he, in his action, is an implicit reality in all that is known. What God reveals is himself, rather than any doctrines about himself. Man, by being intelligent, rational, a true personality, is receptive of the self-revelation of God, as he is receptive of the knowledge of an objective world about him.

Whether or not the spontaneous idea of God arising from experience, is supported by sufficient further self-disclosures through nature and history, to stand as verified, as well as enlarged, in rational thought, is made the point of inquiry throughout the rest of the volume. The author shows how God has made a revelation of himself in the universe, both in nature and in man, and peculiarly in Christ. In doing this he points out how the existence of an absolute or unconditioned Being is manifested in the universe, as well as required as a first principle of reason and a necessary law of thought. In the cosmological argument this absolute Being is shown to be the First Cause, transcending the universe. In the physico-theological, or design argument, the evidence becomes overwhelming that the absolute Being is a rational Power, a purposing Intelligence, the personal God. This conclusion is enforced by the self-revelation of God traced in the constitution and history of man.

The rest of the volume carries forward the evidence of this self-revelation of God in Christ as the Redeemer of man from sin. The essential characteristics of this are traced, together with the relations of this supernatural disclosure to the system and operation of nature. The whole discussion, traversing a vast field of thought and employing the latest and best results of science and philosophy, forms a most impressive presentation and defense of the foundations of Christian truth.

In a work of such wide range, involving so many and such difficult questions, it is not to be expected that an author's views should command assent as to every particular. We are not able to agree with all the views Dr. Harris presents. It is hardly sure that he does not give the evolution philosophy too thorough a shaping power in his conception of nature, in harmony with which he adjusts the scheme of revelation. It seems to us, too, that in his recoil from the old extreme severance between Natural and Revealed Theology, he is seeking unduly to blot out the real distinction between them. Specially untenable, psychologically and philosophically, we believe to be his assertion that men have an "immediate consciousness of God." Considerable effort is made to establish this form of statement. The author seems to suppose that he proves its correctness when he shows that "we know God in experience," using the two forms of expression as equivalent. This can be done only by giving the term "immediate consciousness" an extension beyond the limits of psychological truth, and making it simply an expression for our whole psychical action, the sum of all our cogni-

tive powers. This is to drop the specific meaning of "consciousness" or "immediate consciousness." No objection can be made against the explanation of the term, which holds that in an act of sense perception, consciousness includes the three elements of content, the psychical act or state, the ego acting, and the external object. When, however, Dr. Harris claims, as a parallel with such immediate consciousness of *material* non-egoistic objects, that there is an immediate consciousness of God, he claims what is not shown. The very effort to show it shows the contrary. For the mode indicated is through the rational "intuition" of certain realities, from which the mind necessarily forms the concept of God. He mentions these elements—"absolute being," and "spirit." We have an intuition of "spirit" in knowing ourselves. "Absolute being" is known "as a necessary truth in rational intuition." Dr. Harris admits that "the components of the idea" appear primarily in the consciousness only as undiscriminated elements. But when we have the two factors of the idea, "absolute being" and "spirit," "we combine the two in one idea of God, the absolute Spirit." "The idea may be formed from them in thought." "The idea is legitimately formed, for the components of it are known in intuition." Thus the very explanation given shows that instead of our knowledge of God being by an "*immediate consciousness*," the idea is "formed" only through and at the end of a process of analysis and synthesis. Happily, while this explanation annuls the claim that this knowledge is by "immediate consciousness," it does not affect its validity or strength. We see no necessity for invoking such an untenable claim, when the argument or evidence is as good or better without it.

M. V.

Some Problems of Philosophy. Archibald Alexander, Professor of Philosophy in Columbia College. pp. 170. 1886.

This is both an interesting and a disappointing book. Interesting because of the importance and variety of the problems presented, and because of the freshness and suggestiveness of some of the discussions. Disappointing, because the analyses are often conducted through ambiguous forms of statement and end without bringing the difficulties into distinct and definite view. A work of this sort, proposing, not a solution of the difficulties of philosophy, but an exposition of them, must have its highest value in the clearness with which it does this, brushing away ambiguities and resolving the difficulties into their precise point, relations and amount. Such a clear statement does most effective philosophical service, preparing the way for satisfactory solution of the problems, if solution be possible, or exhibiting the irreducible elements, if insoluble. To present a problem in its last analysis is often the next thing to a full explanation. The author has made excessive, and sometimes misleading use of the disjunctive method. The alternatives presented are not always the only possible ones, though treated as such.

For illustration of these faults take, for instance, the tenth chapter, on The Immortality of the Soul. Almost at the start a degree of indefiniteness is introduced in the words "unknown" and "proven," both having a variable sense. After the statement that if the knowledge is by inference, and "the inference must be from known or unknown premises," the author excludes the first alternative by declaring that "if the premises are known they must be *post mortem* premises." This arbitrarily assumes that there are no facts, spiritual or any other, in man's present life, from which a legitimate inference may be drawn on the subject. And the chapter ends with the conclusion: "The problem of immortality lies therefore outside of the circle of theoretical philosophy"—a statement which, if "theoretical philosophy" means what it has always been accepted as meaning, is authorized neither by the facts in the case nor the author's own reasoning. His conclusion in the problem of The Infinite, p. 117, is determined by a confounding of a 'knowledge of the infinite' with 'infinite knowledge.' M. V.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Masters of the Situation, or Some Secrets of Success and Power. By William James Tilley, B. D. pp. 338.

If, as the author quaintly illustrates in the preface, the question as to whether a man has a call to write is dependent upon whether others have a call to read, then Mr. Tilley has received, in no uncertain tones, a call for just such a volume as he has prepared. Its intensely practical nature is at once evident on glancing at the table of topics discussed. Among these are Promptness, Individuality, Application, Habit, Manners, Genius, &c.

These subjects are old, and upon them much has been written, so that at first one might feel inclined to imagine that this volume contains only what has already been presented scores of times. But the error of such first impression will become apparent on reading but a few pages. While, of course, the truths of the important subjects discussed are always the same, the treatment of them in this work is carried forward in an exceedingly fresh and attractive manner. Instead of the abstract, the concrete form is employed, and for this purpose the history of politics, literature, art and science has been ransacked and made to contribute.

We cannot too highly recommend this volume, especially as a work for young men. It is quickening and stimulating in its effects, healthful in tone, and cannot but be serviceable in bringing about a higher, more earnest type of Christian manhood. M. V.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. By John A. Broadus, D. D., LL. D. pp. 610.

The title on the back of this book runs "AN AMERICAN COMMENTARY

ON THE NEW TESTAMENT." The internal make-up has in this title a fair indication and this is one of its greatest merits. It is throughout practical, and withal lucid and intelligible to any ordinary capacity. Laymen who are readers, and Sunday-school teachers who are fit for their position, as well as pastors will be sure by the use of this work to gain as a rule a clearer and fuller vision of the truth which is conveyed in the language of the Evangelist.

The great German Commentaries appear to be written mostly for the benefit of eminent Biblical scholars. They are largely made up of critical controversies on points which perplex advanced students, and as they handle these vexed questions, which are of no practical import, the professors and other learned men generally speak of them in very complimentary terms and this is enough to make them popular. Very few of course will admit that they do not understand them, and fortunately no official examination is ever made on this point.

This work is none the less learned because it possesses an American character and is adapted to the wants of American students of the Bible. The author's name is a guarantee for that. He has had many years of experience as Professor of the Interpretation of the New Testament. Every page of the commentary reveals his familiarity with the Greek tongue of the original and his thorough mastery of this Gospel combined with a rare exegetical faculty. The result before us is in fact the best warrant for his statement that twenty years of labor have been bestowed upon the preparation of the work. This is a nobler testimony not only to the Bible but to the man himself, than the claim made for certain "Notes" on the New Testament some years ago that "they were prepared before breakfast." Dr. Broadus had even the advantage of traversing the Holy Land and thereby making his eyes familiar with the sacred scenes that have so important a bearing upon the interpretation of many historical passages.

The commentary is based on the Common English Version, but the Revised Version in its *American* form is given in parallel columns with the other, the marginal renderings of the Common and the Revised Versions are usually noticed, and the early English translations are mentioned when likely to profit the general reader.

Of course on points where the Baptists divide from the other Christian bodies the Baptist position is frankly and earnestly maintained, but this is a much lesser evil than the specious rationalism which insinuates itself into almost every one of the great Bible Commentaries of Europe. The "Homiletical and Practical" supplement to each division is judicious and valuable, the author having eminent homiletical talent. An able general Introduction to the New Testament by Dr. Hovey, the general editor of the series, is prefixed. It is in nearly all its features a work worthy of a place among the best expositions of this gospel.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Pocket Atlas of the World. A comprehensive and popular series of Maps Illustrating Physical and Political Geography. By John Bartholomew, F. R. G. S. With Geographical Notes. 1887.

It is no small satisfaction to be able to carry the world in one's pocket. With this little volume one may have that pleasure. It contains 54 different maps and is just what a traveler or a student at home wants to have with him all the time. Those maps giving the environs of large cities like New York, London, Liverpool, Edinburgh, Glasgow, &c., will prove especially serviceable. Then there are statistical tables summarizing the leading facts of General Geography, Population, Commerce, Routes of Travel, &c., &c., with a very interesting list of important words or syllables often occurring in the composition of geographical names, giving their etymological import. The little work is gotten up very neatly and substantially. It is a gem of *multum in parvo*.

Chivalric Days, and the Boys and Girls who helped to make them. By E. S. Brooks, author of "Historic Boys." Illustrated. pp. 308. 1887.

Mr. Brooks is becoming one of the most popular and successful writers for girls and boys. His "Historic boys" was widely recognized as one of the best works of its kind, and his contributions to *St. Nicholas* are among the most valuable features of that splendid journal. "Chivalric Days" tells the story of certain notable scenes and occasions in the world's history, ranging from the days of the Pharaohs to those of the American Revolution, tales full of absorbing interest and told in a strain well calculated to kindle in the young the noble virtues of chivalric days. For the author keeps the attention riveted not only on the quaint customs and costumes, the manners and the home-life, but also on the simple and homely morals of those far-off days. The work, which comprises stories of the girls as well as the boys of the past, is issued in uniform style with "Historic Days." It is profusely illustrated and elegantly printed and bound.

The Story of the Saracens, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Bagdad. By Arthur Gilman, M. A., author of "The Story of Rome," etc. pp. xvii, 493.

The Story of Carthage. By Alfred J. Church, M. A., Professor of Latin in University College, London, with the collaboration of Arthur Gilman, M. A. pp. xx, 309.

Here are two more volumes of the "Story of the Nations" series. We have had occasion to notice previous ones, and we find that all the merits of those belong to these. We commend the enterprise of the publishers in undertaking the series, and for the excellent and attractive form in which the books appear. Paper, printing, binding, all are good. The editor, too, deserves praise for the excellence of his work.

Each book has a map, and illustrations appear here and there throughout its pages. They are books specially for the young student but older ones, too, will find them readable and profitable.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

The Throne of Grace, or A Call to Prayer. By M. Rhodes, D. D., Author of "Expository Lectures on Philippians," "Life Thoughts for Young Men," "Life Thoughts for Young Women," "Recognition in Heaven," "Vital Questions pertaining to Christian Belief," etc., etc. pp. 250.

All the books that Dr. Rhodes has written are characterized by a devout spirit, striking thoughts happily expressed, and lessons that ought to prove exceedingly helpful to the reader. His intense earnestness glows on every page. His last, entitled "The Throne of Grace," is like the rest in their best features. It embraces fourteen chapters on Prayer which were delivered as a series of lectures before his congregation. Among the subjects are, "God the Hearer of Prayer," "The Nature of Prayer," "Conditions of Effectual Prayer," "Intercessory Prayer," "What Shall We Pray For?" "Secret Prayer," "The Church and Prayer." The book is sent out on its mission of good, and we trust that mission will be a wide and useful one. It is well adapted to do an inestimable service in promoting Christian life and duty.

FLEMING H. REVELL, 148-150 MADISON ST., CHICAGO.

Current Discussions in Theology. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. IV. pp. 336.

This is an annual report on the conspicuous phases of theological thought throughout the world. Each professor reaps in his own special field and here are the garnered-sheaves of all. It is an excellent plan, and it would be well if the faculties of other seminaries would do the same. With different bases of selection, the gleanings would be different, and we should thus have fuller and more varied results.

The *first* part here is "Exegetical Theology," with subdivisions "Old Testament" and "New Testament;" *second*, "Historical Theology" embracing recent studies in the history of the Early Church, Church of the Middle Ages, Modern Church; *third* part, "Systematic Theology," covering Dogmatics, Apologetics, Theism and Ethics; *fourth* part, "Practical Theology," with subdivisions "Homiletics" and "Pastoral Theology." Short reviews are given of many of the principal books that have appeared, which will be helpful to the reader for further investigation. The year covered by this volume ends with June, 1886.

G. W. FREDERICK, PHILADELPHIA.

The Evangelical Pastor. By Rev. Edward T. Horn, A. M., Pastor of St. John's, Charleston, S. C. pp. 256.

The Questions and Answers which form the bulk of this book are

founded on Dr. Walther's *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie*, made up mainly of the decisions of the Fathers of the Reformation on matters likely to perplex the judgment and the conscience of every pastor. They have the flavor of the 16th century, but old wine like this will be a good tonic to many whose pastoral life has been enfeebled by too free a use of the patent *nostrums* which are so popular in our American ecclesiasticism. We should have preferred an original work from the clever young author, and no doubt the substance would have been essentially the same, but he preferred to have those views on practical theology come out with the weight of authority attaching to such names as Luther, Bugenhagen, Chemnitz and Spener. No work is more needed by our English Lutheran pastors than one of this character, and while neither personally endorsing every position taken in this little volume, nor expecting the adoption of all its suggestions by our pastors, we believe that its general circulation will exert a powerful influence in developing a ministerial conscience and moving pastors everywhere to do things in the house of God "decently and in order."

T. H. DIEHL, ALLENTOWN.

Biblical History, Comprising Old and New Testament, explained by Catechism, Parallel Bible Verses and Hymn Stanzas, and Illustrated with 125 Engravings and Maps. Old Testament, pp. 150. The New Testament, 138.

This "Bible History" first appeared in German some years ago and met with such favor that a number of editions were called for. It is now published in this English form and is destined to have a wide use in Sunday-schools and families. Greater familiarity with the Scriptures is one of the most pressing needs of the age and we know of no better work for learning the historical part by children than the volume before us, using as it does the words of the Bible itself, giving a continuous history, and abounding in capital illustrations.

PAMPHLETS.

Evolution, as Taught in the Bible. By Rev. G. C. H. Hasskarl. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

Colleges North and Colleges South An address by Dr. Julius D. Dreher, President of Roanoke College, before the department of Higher Instruction of the National Educational Association, at Topeka, Kansas, July 16, 1886. Salem, Mass., Observer Book and Job Print.

An Easter Service for Sunday Schools. Crowning the Cross by Rev. M. F. Troxell, Kansas City, Mo.

Fifty Years in the Pastoral Relation. A sermon preached by Rev. N. Van Alstine at Raymerton, N. Y., Oct. 10, 1886. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia.

Twentieth Anniversary Sermon. Preached by Rev. William Hull before St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Hudson, N. Y. F. H. Webb, Printer, Hudson, N. Y.